Vigiliae Christianae

Volume 54
2000

Reprinted with the permission of the original publisher
by
Periodicals Service Company
Germantown, NY
2005

Printed on acid-free paper.

This reprint was reproduced from the
best original edition copy available.

NOTE TO THE REPRINT EDITION:
In some cases full page advertisements which do not add to
the scholarly value of this volume have been omitted.
As a result, some reprinted volumes may have irregular pagination.

VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

LIV

Vigiliae Christianae

A Review of Early Christian Life and Language

VOLUME LIV

BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON • KÖLN
2000

SWETS
BACKSETS SERVICE
Reprinted with permission of Brill Academic Publishers - Leiden by
SWETS & ZEITLINGER BV
LISSE - THE NETHERLANDS - 2003
www.swets.nl/backsets

Editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Amsterdam
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
W.L. Petersen, State College, Pennsylvania
D.T. Runia, Leiden
J.C.M. van Winden, Leiden

Associate Editors

A. Le Boulluec (Paris) – A. Davids (Nijmegen) – R.M. Grant (Chicago) – Marguerite Harl (Paris) – J.-P. Mahé (Paris) – J. van Oort (Utrecht) – Elaine Pagels (Princeton) G. Rouwhorst (Utrecht) – R. Staats (Kiel)

© Copyright 2000 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

ISSN 0042-6032

CONTENTS

I Articles

A. Alcock, The Agape 208
D.J. Bingham, Justin and Isaiah 53 248
A.P. Bos, Basilides as an Aristotelianizing Gnostic 44
A. Canellis, Saint Jérôme et les passions: Sur les «*Quattuor Perturbationes*» des *Tusculanes* 178
J.A. Draper, Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache 7-10* 121
M.J. Edwards, Clement of Alexandria and his Doctrine of the Logos 159
G. Hays, A Second Look at Fulgentius's *Alexander* 204
J. Hofmann, Christliche Frauen im Dienst kleinasiatischer Gemeinden des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts. Eine prosopographische studie 283
M. Horsfall Scotti, The *Asclepius*: Thoughts on a Re-opened Debate 396
V. Hunink, Apuleius, Pudentilla, and Christianity 80
H.M. Knapp, Melito's Use of Scipture in *Peri Pascha*, Second-Century Typology 313
N. Koltun-Fromm, Sexuality and Holiness: Semitic Christian and Jewish Conceptualizations of Sexual Behavior 375
M. Laird, "By Faith Alone": A Technical Term in Gregory of Nyssa 61
E. Laupot, Tacitus' Fragment 2: The Anti-Roman Movement of the *Christiani* and the Nazoreans 233
R.A. Layton, *Propatheia*: Origen and Didymus on the Origin of the Passions 262
H.E. Lona, Zur Struktur von Diog 5-6 32
E.P. Meijering, Irenäus zum zeitlichen Anfang der Welt 1
O. Nicholson, Constantine's Vision of the Cross 309
E. Osborn, Love of Enemies and Recapitulation 12
H. Seng, Aspekte Metrischer Theorie im *Cathemerinon* des Prudentius 417

II Reviews

ALLEN, P., R. CANNING & L. CROSS (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* (H.G. Schipper) 335
Athanasius' Werke (J. Leemans) 210
BETTIOLO, PAOLO, ALDA GIAMBELLUCA KOSSOVA, CLAUDIO LEONARDI, ENRICO NORELLI, LORENZO PERRONE (eds.), *Ascensio Isaiae* (A. Hilhorst) 111
BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, J.M., A. GONZÁLEZ BLANCO & R. GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ (ed.), *La Tradición en la Antigüedad Tardía* (H.G. Schipper) 337
Der Erste Clemensbrief (B. Dehandschutter) 326
FEATHERSTONE, J.M. (ed.), *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815* (K.-H. Uthemann) 218
Franz Overbeck, Werke und Nachlaß (K. Fitschen) 106
GEORGIOS, MAKRIS, *Ignatio Diakonos und die Vita des hl. Gregorios Dekapolites* (K.-H. UTHEMANN) 220
KIMBER BUELL, DENISE, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the rhetoric of legitimacy* (A. van den Hoek) 432
KINDERMANN, U., *Einführung in die lateinische Literatur des mittelalterlichen Europa* (J. Boeft) 448
St. Leo the Great: Sermons (H.G. Schipper) 100
LOUTH, A., *Maximus the Confessor* (B. Janssens) 102
MAGNUS, GREGORIUS, *Homiliae in Evangelica* (B. Müller) 439
Saint MAXIME LE CONFESSEUR, *Opuscules théologiques et polémiques* (B. Roosen) 214
MGALOBLISHVILI, TAMILLA (ed.), *Ancient Christianity in the Caucasus* (J. van. Oort) 448
PIZZOLATO, Luigi F., *Morir Giovani. Il pensiero antico di fronte allo scandalo della morte prematura* (J. den Boeft) 446
POUDERON, BERNARD, *D'Athènes à Alexandrie, Études sur Althénagore et les origines de la philosophie chrétienne* (K.-H. Uthemann) 225
Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics (J. Leemans) 97
Recherches Augustiniennes (D. Weber) 95
ROBERGE, MICHAEL, *La Paraphrase de Sem* (G. Quispel) 444
SINNIGE, Th.G., *Six Lectures on Plotinus and Gnosticism* (G. Quispel) 109
TERTULLIEN, *Contre Hermogène* (H. Träkle) 332
ULRICH, JÖRG, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden. Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (A. van den Hoek) 435

WELLSTEIN, M, *Nova Verba in Tertullians Schriften gegen die Häretiker aus montanistischer* (H. Tränkle) 331
WURST, GREGOR, *Die Bêma-Psalmen* (I. Gardner) 324

Books Received 115, 228, 338, 450

IRENÄUS ZUM ZEITLICHEN ANFANG DER WELT

VON

E.P. MEIJERING

In der modernen Forschung wird seit dem Aufsatz, den R.M. Grant im Jahre 1949 der Stellung des Irenäus zur Philosophie und Rhetorik widmete, seine skeptische Art des Argumentierens hervorgehoben.[1] Namentlich W.R. Schoedel hat gezeigt, daß er bei der Beantwortung der Frage, was Gott tat, bevor er die Welt erschuf, typisch als Skeptiker und Empiriker argumentiert, der sich an das Augenscheinliche hält und auf die Erforschung der Ursachen verzichtet.[2] Den Einfluß des Platonikers Atticus, der gegen die Epikureer und gegen Aristoteles mit der Lehre vom zeitlichen Anfang der Welt die Schöpfung und die Vorsehung verteidigt, hält er offensichtlich für weniger wichtig.[3] In vorliegendem Aufsatz wollen wir versuchen, zu zeigen, daß Irenäus sich bei der Beantwortung der Frage des zeitlichen Anfangs der Welt an die Platoniker anlehnt, die den *Timäus* buchstäblich interpretieren.

Zunächst sei festgestellt, daß die kurze Definition der Lehre Platons, wie sie Irenäus einmal bietet, typisch für den zeitgenössischen Schul- oder mittleren Platonismus its: Platon spricht von Gott, der Idee und der Materie. Das sind die drei ἀρχαί des mittleren Platonismus.[4] Zu diesen

---

[1] R.M. Grant, Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture, *The Harvard Theological Review* (XLII) 1949, SS 41ff., W.R. Schoedel, Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus, *Vigiliae Christianae* (XIII) 1959, SS 22ff., ders., Theological Method in Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses* 2, 25-28), *The Journal of Theological Studies* (35) 1984, SS 31ff., W.C. van Unnik, Theological Speculation and Its Limits, *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition. In Honorem Robert M. Gant, edited by* W.R. Schoedel and R.L. Wilken, Paris 1979, SS 33ff.

[2] Theological Method, SS 31ff.

[3] Theological Method, S 39.

[4] *Adv. Haer.* 2,14,3 (Die Zitate aus *Adversus Haereses* werden aus der Ausgabe in den *Sources Chrétiennes* geboten): Plato vero rursus materiam dicit et exemplum et Deum, vgl. hierzu Albinus, *Epitome* 9,1, weitere Stellen in J.H. Waszinks Ausgabe von Calcidius, S 308, siehe auch R.A. Norris Jr, Irenaeus and Plotinus answer the Gnostics: A Note on the Relation between Christian Thought and Platonism, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* (XXXVI) 1980, S 19.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

Schulplatonikern gehört auch Atticus. Atticus vertritt bekanntlich—wie auch Plutarch—innerhalb des Platonismus die Lehrposition einer Minderheit, die lautet, daß der *Timäus* besagen will, daß die Welt einen zeitlichen Anfang hat, und daß sich das Schöpfungshandeln des Demiurgen in der Zeit vollzieht. Auf die auffällige Übereinstimmung zwischen Irenäus und Atticus in der Benutzung Platons im Zusammenhang mit der Lehre von der Schöpfung und der Vorsehung ist bereits—unabhängig voneinander—von W.C. van Unnik und vom Verfasser hingewiesen worden. Atticus und Irenäus zitieren beide *Timäus* 29E (Gott hat aus neidloser Güte die Welt erschaffen) und *Leges* 715E (der gerechte Gott umfaßt den Anfang, die Mitte und das Ende aller Dinge), um zu beweisen, daß es eine Schöpfung und eine Vorsehung gibt.[5] Atticus führt dieses explizit gegen Epikur und Aristoteles aus, Irenäus gegen Marcion und die Gnostiker.[6] Es hat aber den Anschein, daß Irenäus auch die Absicht hat, zu zeigen, daß Platon in dieser Hinsicht der Vorzug gegenüber Epikur gebührt. Ausdrücklich stellt er fest, daß einige der Heiden in geringerem Maße den Verlockungen und Lüsten erlegen waren und nicht in dem Maße der Abgötterei verfallen waren und deshalb, wenn auch nur schwach von der Vorsehung dazu bewegt, von dem Schöpfer dieses Alls gesagt haben, daß er als Vater seine Vorsehung über alles erstreckt und unsere Welt regiert.[7] Es könnte sich hier durchaus um eine Anspielung an die im Altertum vielzitierte Stelle aus dem *Timäus* han-

---

[5] *Timäus* 29E: ἀγαθὸς ἦν, ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος, *Leges* 715E: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχήν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἔχων, εὐθείᾳ περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος,—siehe E.P. Meijering, *God Being History. Studies in Patristic Philosophy*, Amsterdam/Oxford/New York 1975, S 28, W.C. van Unnik, Two Notes on Irenaeus, *Vigiliae Christianae* (30) 1976, SS 206f.

[6] Siehe Atticus, *Atticos, Fragments de son oeuvre avec introduction et notes, éd. par* J. Baudry, Paris 1931, Fragm. 3,2: ὁ μὲν Πλάτων εἰς θεὸν καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πάντα ἀνάπτει (es folgen die beiden Zitate), Irenäus, *Adv. Haer.* 3,25,5: Quibus religiosior Plato ostenditur, qui eundem Deum et iustum et bonum confessus est, habentem potestatem omnium, ipsum facientem iudicium, sic dicens . . . (*Leges* 715E). Et iterum Factorem et Fabricatorem huius universitatis bonum ostendit (*Timäus* 29E). Eine Anspielung an den Text aus den *Leges* liegt vielleicht in *Adv. Haer.* 2, 1, 1 vor, wo gegen die Möglichkeit weiterer göttlichen Wesen außer dem einen Schöpfer gesagt wird: Et terminum autem et medietatem et finem habebit ad eos qui sunt extra eum; für mögliche weitere Anspielungen bei Irenäus an die Stelle aus dem *Timäus* siehe E.P. Meijering, *God Being History*, S 27, Anm. 19.

[7] *Adv. Haer.* 3,25,1: Et propter hoc ethnicorum quidam, qui minus illecebris servierunt et non in tantum superstitione idolorum abducti sunt, providentia eius moti licet tenuiter, tamen conversi sunt ut dicerent Fabricatorem huius universitatis Patrem omnium providentem et disponentem secundum nos mundum. Vielleicht denkt er auch insbesondere an Platon und die Platoniker, wenn er feststellt, die Heiden hätten trotz ihrer Abgötterei den ersten Platz der Gottheit dem Schöpfer dieses Alls zuerkannt, *Adv. Haer.*

deln, an der von dem Schöpfer und Vater dieses Alls die Rede ist.[8] Der Vorwurf, man sei den Verlockungen und Lüsten erlegen, wird bekanntlich von den Christen insbesondere gegen Epikur und seine Anhänger erhoben.[9] Die Epikureer wollen mit der Frage, was Gott vor der Erschaffung der Welt tat, vor allem erfahren, *weshalb* Gott oder die Götter in jener unendlichen Zeit nichts tat(en). Da man diese Frage aber nicht in einer triftigen Weise beantworten kann, muß die Vorstellung einer Erschaffung der Welt ihrer Meinung nach also abgelehnt werden, da es sich hier um eine Handlung aufgrund eines willkürlichen Sinneswandels handeln würde.[10]

Est ist wahr, daß Irenäus in skeptischer Weise diese Frage nach dem Warum (des Zeitpunktes) der Schöpfung nicht beantworten will. Typisch christlich theologisch ist seine Feststellung, diese Beantwortung sollte Gott überlassen werden.[11] Gottes Handeln unterliegt dem freien Willen Gottes. Das gilt von dem ganzen Offenbarungshandeln Gottes seit der Schöpfung.[12] Auch in dieser Hinsicht ähnelt die Lehrposition des Irenäus der des Atticus. Auch Atticus führt die Schöpfung und die Vorsehung auf den Willen Gottes zurück. Wir halten es für sehr wahrscheinlich, daß Irenäus die bei Atticus vorliegende Beweisführung für die These gekannt hat, daß nicht alles was geworden ist, damit auch vergänglich ist, und daß nicht alles, was unvergänglich ist, deshalb auch ungeworden ist. Atticus weist in diesem Zusammenhang auf den berühmten Passus *Timäus* 41A/B hin, in dem es heißt, daß was durch den Willen Gottes erschaffen worden ist, deshalb an sich vergänglich ist, aber durch den Willen Gottes vor dem Untergang behütet

---

2,9,2: Illi enim creaturae potius quam Creatori servientes et his qui non sunt dii, verumtamen primum deitatis locum adtribuunt Fabricatori huius universtitatis Deo. Hier ist der Unterschied zu den Gnostikern offensichtlich. Sie behaupten eine vollkommene Erkenntnis zu haben, erweisen sich aber als schlimmer als die Heiden und blasphemischer in ihrem Verhalten dem eigenen Schöpfer gegenüber, *ibid.*: Et qui dicunt semetipsos perfectos et universorum habere agnitionem ethnicis peiores et magis blasphemi sensu etiam adversus suum Factorem inveniuntur.

[8] *Timäus* 28C: τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν. Zur Verwendung dieses Textes bei frühchristlichen Autoren siehe J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig/Berlin 1907, SS 174f., H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge 1965, S 429.

[9] Siehe W. Schmid, Art. 'Epikur', *RAC (5)*, Sp 781.

[10] Siehe z.B. Lukrez, *De rerum natura* 5, 168-169: quidve novi potuit tanto post ante quietos (sc. deos)/inlicere ut cuperent vitam mutare priorem, vgl. hierzu E. Peters, What was God doing, before He created Heavens and the Earth, *Augustiniana* (34) 1984, SS 53ff.

[11] *Adv. Haer.* 2,28,3: Ut, puta, si quis interroget: Antequam mundum faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicemus quoniam ista responsio subiacet Deo.

[12] Siehe hierzu ausführlicher E.P. Meijering, *God Being History*, SS 19ff.

werden kann.[13] Auf diesen Passus liegt ein klarer Hinweis bein Justin vor im Zusammenhang mit seiner Beweisführung für die Unsterblichkeit der Seele.[14] Wir halten es aber für möglich, daß Irenäus jene Stelle genauer gekannt hat (vielleicht über Atticus). Der Demiurg richtet sich dort an die von ihm erschaffenen niedrigeren Götter, mit denen die Himmelskörper gemeint sein könnten.[15] Die Deutung der niedrigeren Götter auf die Himmelskörper könnte Irenäus bekannt gewesen sein. Das würde erklären, weshalb er die Erhaltung der durch den Willen Gottes erschaffenen Seelen durch denselben Willen Gottes damit vergleicht, daß die Himmelskörper ja auch durch den Willen Gottes erschaffen worden sind, aber durch diesen Willen lange Zeit vor dem Untergang behütet werden.[16] An dieser Stelle zeigt sich der eklektische Gebrauch, den Irenäus vom Platonismus macht. Er lehnt die Lehre von der Präexistenz der Seelen ab. Diese Lehre, die mit der Lehre von der Seelenwanderung eng verbunden ist, ist nach Irenäus von Platon erfunden worden.[17] Die typisch platonische Begründung der Unsterblichkeit der Seele mit ihrer Präexistenz[18] widerlegt Irenäus also mit der ebenfalls platonischen Lehre, daß was durch den Willen Gottes erschaffen worden ist auch durch den Willen Gottes vor dem Untergang behütet werden kann. Dieser platonische Gedanke muß ihm deshalb wichtig und nützlich gewesen sein, da er an sich die These bejaht, daß was einen zeitlichen Anfang hat auch ein zeitliches Ende haben muß.[19]

Atticus ist der Meinung, daß die Verneinung des zeitlichen Anfangs der Welt die Leugnung einer Schöpfung und einer Vorsehung notwendiger-

---

[13] Fragm. 4,2: Ἐπειδὴ γάρ, φησι, γεγένησθε (λέγει δὲ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς), ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ οὐδ' ἄλυτοι τὸ πάμπαν, οὔτι μὲν δὴ λυθήσεσθε τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως τυχόντες, 4,15: Μείζων δὲ ἄλλος εἰς σωτηρίαν τῶν γενομένων δεσμὸς οὐκ ἔστι τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βουλήσεως.

[14] *Dialogus* 5,3: . . . Πλάτων Τιμαίῳ αἰνίσσεται περὶ τοῦ κόσμου, λέγων ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν καὶ φθαρτός ἐστιν ἢ γέγονεν, οὐ λυθήσεται δὲ οὐδὲ τεύξεται θανάτου μοίρας διὰ τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ. Siehe hierzu J.C.M. van Winden, *An Early Christian Philosopher. Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho. Chapters One to Nine. Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Leiden 1971, SS 84ff.

[15] Vgl. A.E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, Oxford 1928, SS 248ff.

[16] *Adv. Haer.* 2,34,3: Quemadmodum enim caelum quod est super nos, firmamentum et sol et luna et reliquae stellae et omne ornamentum ipsorum, cum ante non essent, facta sunt et multo tempore perseverant secundum voluntatem Dei, sic et de animabus et de spiritibus et omnino de omnibus quae facta sunt cogitans quis non peccabit, quando omnia quae facta sunt initium quidem facturae suae habeant, perseverant autem quoadusque ea Deus et esse et perseverare voluerit . . .

[17] *Adv. Haer.* 2,33,2: Ad haec Plato vetus ille Atheniensis, qui et primus sententiam hanc (sc. de corpore in corpus transmigratione, siehe 2, 33, 1) introduxit . . .

[18] Siehe Platon, *Phaedrus* 245C ff.

[19] *Adv. Haer.* 4,4,1: quaecumque enim temporale initium habent, necesse est ea finem habere temporalem, 3,8,3: quaecumque autem initium sumpserunt et dissolutionem possunt percipere.

weise mit sich bringt.[20] Aus demselben Grunde betont Irenäus den zeitlichen Anfang der Welt. Mit ihm ist gegeben, daß die Welt tatsächlich von Gott erschaffen worden ist.[21] Es gibt ein Warum der Schöpfung: die Güte Gottes, die von Gott in freier Weise betätigt wird.[22] Der theologische Grund, weshalb Irenäus in typisch skeptischer Weise auf die Angabe des Warums der Naturfakten und des Handelns Gottes verzichtet, ist u.E., daß namentlich die Epikureer solche Erklärungen bieten, um damit auszuschließen, daß diese Fakten auf ein Eingreifen der Götter zurückgeführt werden können.[23] Deshalb braucht man die Götter ihrer Meinung nach nicht zu fürchten. Diese Furchtlosigkeit führt nach den Christen aber zu dem ethisch verwerflichen Leben der Epikureer. Die Leugnung der Schöpfung und der Vorsehung haben die Gnostiker und Marcion nach Irenäus von den Epikureern übernommen. Das spricht er explizit in dem bekannten Passus aus, in dem er die gnostischen Theorien auf die griechischen Philosophenschulen zurückführt. Dort heißt es, die gnostische Rede von dem *vacuum*, in dem die Welt entstanden ist, sei aus der Lehre des Democritus und Epikur von dem *vacuum* und den Atomen abgeleitet. Er wiederholt diesen Vorwurf in dem Passus, in dem er zeigt, wie sich Platon günstig von den Gnostikern und Marcion unterscheidet.[24] Diese Lehre steht in schroffem Gegensatz zum christlichen Glauben an den Schöpfer, der nicht zugelassen hat, daß etwas in einem *vacuum* entstanden ist, sondern alles vor der Schöpfung geordnet hat.[25]

---

[20] Fragment 4,2: Πρῶτον δὴ περὶ γενέσεως κόσμου σκοπῶν (ὁ Πλάτων), καὶ τὸ τῆς προνοίας τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ πολυωφελὲς δόγμα πάντα ζητεῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἡγούμενος, καὶ λογισάμενος ὅτι τῷ μὴ γενομένῳ οὔτε τινὸς ποιητοῦ οὔτε τινὸς κηδεμόνος πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι καλῶς χρεία, ἵνα μὴ ἀποστερήσῃ τὸν κόσμον τῆς προνοίας, ἀφεῖλε τὸ ἀγέννητον αὐτοῦ.

[21] *Adv. Haer.* 2,28,3: quoniam autem mundus hic factus est ἀποτελεστικῶς ab eo, temporale initium accipiens, Scripturae nos docent ...

[22] Siehe z.B. *Adv. Haer.* 2,29,2: Φύσεως ⟨γὰρ⟩ κρείττων ὁ θεός, ἔχων παρ' αὐτῷ τὸ θέλειν, ὅτι ἀγαθός ἐστι.

[23] Siehe W. Schmid, Art. 'Epikur', Sp 715.

[24] *Adv. Haer.* 2,14,3: Umbram autem et vacuum ipsorum a Democrito et Epicuro sumentes sibimetipsis aptaverunt, cum illi primum multum sermonem fecerint de vacuo et de atomis, quorum alterum quidem quid esse vocaverunt, alterum vero quod non est vocaverunt. 3,24,2: ... eum vero qui non est somniantes super hunc, ut magnum Deum putentur adinvenisse quem nemo possit cognoscere, humano generi <non> communicantem nec terrena administrantem, Epicuri videlicet invenientes Deum, neque sibi neque aliis aliquid praestantem, hoc est nullius providentiam habentem. Später innerhalb dieses Abschnittes folgt der in Anm. 6 zitierte Hinweis auf Platon, der, anders als Marcion, den guten und den gerechten Gott identifiziert.

[25] *Adv. Haer.* 2,4,1: Causa igitur quaerenda est huiusmodi dispositionis Dei, sed non fabricatio mundi alteri adscribenda; et ante praeparata omnia dicenda sunt a Deo ut fierent quemadmodum et facta sunt, sed non umbra et vacuitas confingenda est.

Wer nun die Beantwortung der Frage nach dem Warum der Schöpfung und ihres Zeitpunktes dem Willen und der Weisheit Gottes überläßt, der wird von der epikureischen und der gnostischen Kritik an dem Glauben an die Schöpfung nicht mehr bedroht. Irenäus versucht allerdings, seine Gegner mit ihren eigenen Waffen zu schlagen. Gegen die Lehre der Gnostiker, die Welt sein in einem *vacuum* außerhalb des Pleromas entstanden wendet er u.a. ein, die Gnostiker könnten keinen Grund angeben, weshalb der höchste Gott diesen Raum in so langer Zeit leer gelassen hat.[26] Im Grunde ist das derselbe Einwand, den die Epikureer gegen den Schöpfungsglauben erheben: der Zeitpunkt ist immer willkürlich. Irenäus wird sich allerdings der Gefährlichkeit dieses von ihm vorgebrachten Argumentes nicht bewußt gewesen sein. Für seinen Glauben ist das Warum dem Schöpfer bekannt, deshalb kann er es ihm überlassen. Für die falschen Theorien der Gnostiker kann es aber gar keinen gültigen Grund geben, deshalb kann er ihnen vorwerfen, sie könnten solch einen Grund selbst gar nicht nennen. Den Vorwurf, sie könnten keinen Grund für ihre Lehren anführen, macht Irenäus den Gnostikern deshalb mehrfach.[27]

Ähnlich verfährt Irenäus im Zusammenhang mit der Lehre von der Erlösung. Er wendet wiederholt gegen die Erlösungslehre der Gnostiker ein, der gute Gott hätte die Schöpfung gar nicht zulassen sollen. Es sei unglaubwürdig, daß ein guter Gott später diesen Irrtum bereut und ihn wieder gutmachen will.[28] Er läßt im Anfang den Irrtum der Schöpfung entstehen und wachsen und versucht ihn später aufzuheben, wenn bereits viele daran untergegangen sind.[29] Wenn der gute Gott später den Fall aufhebt und so zu sagen den Flecken reinigt, dann konnte er noch viel eher dafür sorgen, daß im Anfang solch ein Flecken gar nicht entstand. Wenn er es zuließ, weil er es nicht verhindern konnte, dann war solch eine Verbesserung auch später nicht möglich. Wenn er sich später der Menschen erbarmte, dann hätte er sich schon ihrer Schöpfer erbarmen müssen und

---

[26] *Adv. Haer.* 2,3,1: Sed ne quidem causam reddere habebunt, propter quam rem locum hunc temporibus tantis otiosum sic reliquit.

[27] Siehe z.B. *Adv. Haer.* 2,12,8; 2,15,1; 2,21,1.

[28] *Adv. Haer.* 2,5,4: Multo enim melius et consequentius et magis deificum erat ut in principio initium excideret huiusmodi necessitatis (sc. ut sit aliquid secundum concessionem praeter sententiam eius), quam postea quasi de paenitentia conaretur tantam fructificationem necessitatis eradicare, vgl. 2,17,11: Si enim praesciebat haec sic futura, quare utique, priusquam fieret, non abscidit ignorantiam ipsorum, quam postea velut ex paenitentia curat per emissionem Christi?

[29] *Adv. Haer.* 2,5,3: Et initio concedens sistere errorem et crescere illum, in posterioribus temporibus solvere eum conatur, quando iam multi male perierunt propter labem.

ihnen die Vollkommenheit geben müssen.[30] Wenn die Existenz Christi erst bei seiner Erscheinung als Mensch begann, und Gott erst seit der Zeit des Kaisers Tiberius daran gedacht hat, seine Vorsehung über die Menschen zu erstrecken, und das Wort nicht immer mit der Schöpfung zusammen war, dann sollte man die Gründe für eine solche Nachlässigkeit erforschen.[31] Dieser Einwand kann selbstverständlich auch gegen die heilsgeschichtliche Theologie des Irenäus selbst erhoben werden, und er ist auch erhoben worden. Er zitiert die kritische Frage, weshalb Gott den Menschen nicht sofort vollkommen erschaffen hat.[32] Dem hält Irenäus entgegen, daß Gott das zwar gekonnt hätte, daß Gott aber wollte, daß der Mensch von seiner Erschaffung an wachsen sollte, um am Ende bei der Verherrlichung von ihm die Vollkommenheit zu erlangen.[33] Die Offenbarung in der Zeit führt er auf den freien Willen oder das Wohlgefallen Gottes zurück.[34] Gott führt den Menschen im Laufe seines Lebens, und er führt, wie ein Familienvater handelnd, das menschliche Geschlecht im Laufe der Zeit auf die Vollkommenheit zu.[35] Diese fortschreitende Offenbarung hat einen guten Grund: Der Mensch konnte nicht gleich im Anfang die Vollkommenheit

---

[30] *Adv. Haer.* 2,4,2: Qui enim postea emendat labem et velut maculam emundat [labem] multo prius poterat observare ne quidem initio in suis fieri talem maculam. Vel si initio quidem concessit, quoniam aliter fieri non poterant quae facta sunt, oportet et semper sic fieri illa: quae enim initio non possunt emendationem percipere, quemadmodum hanc postea percipient? ... Et si ideo quod benignus sit, in novissimis temporibus misertus est hominum et perfectum eis dat, illorum primo misereri debuit qui fuerunt hominis factores et dare eis perfectum. ... Si enim operis ipsorum misertus est, multo prius illorum misereri debuit et non sinere in tantum caecitatis venire eos.

[31] *Adv. Haer.* 4,6,2: Si autem Christus tunc inchoavit esse quando et secundum hominem adventum suum egit, et a temporibus Tiberii Caesaris commemoratus est Pater providere hominibus, et non semper Verbum ejus una cum plasmate fuisse ostendebatur, ... tunc ... oportuit ... causas tantae incuriae et neglegentiae ejus inquiri.

[32] *Adv. Haer.* 4,38,1: Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις· Οὐκ ἠδύνατο ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τέλειον πεποιηκέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

[33] *Adv. Haer.* 4,38,1: ... τῷ μὲν θεῷ ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ὄντι καὶ ἀγενήτῳ ὑπάρχοντι, ὡς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν πάντα δυνατά, 4,38,3: Ἔδει δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πρῶτον γενέσθαι, καὶ γενόμενον αὐξῆσαι, καὶ αὐξήσαντα ἀνδρωθῆναι, καὶ ἀνδρωθέντα πληθυνθῆναι, καὶ πληθυνθέντα ἐνισχῦσαι, καὶ ἐνισχύσαντα δὲ δοξασθῆναι, καὶ δοξασθέντα ἰδεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Δεσπότην.

[34] Siehe die vom Verfasser gesammelten Stellen, *God Being History*, S 28, Anm. 25. Zum Gedanken, daß Gott frei ist in seiner Offenbarung, siehe *Adv. Haer.* 4,6,7: Ab initio enim assistens Filius suo plasmati, revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult et quando vult et quemadmodum vult Pater, 4,20,5: ille (sc. Deus) autem volens videbitur hominibus, quibus vult et quando vult et quemadmodum vult.

[35] Siehe *Adv. Haer.* 4,9,1: Der Familienvater behandelt seine Knechte anders als seine Freien und seine Kinder wiederum anders: Paterfamilias enim dominus est, qui universae domui paternae dominatur, et servis quidem adhuc indisciplinatis condignam tradens legem, liberis autem et fide iustificatis congruentia dans praecepta, et filiis aperiens suam hereditatem, vgl. ferner 4,9,3; 4,11,1; 4,13,2; 4,20,7. Das auch für Irenäus so

empfangen, da er noch ein Kind war.[36] Die Gnostiker leugnen eine fortschreitende Offenbarung seit dem Anfang der Welt und glauben an eine 'plötzliche' Errettung durch Christus. Diese hätte nach Irenäus dann aber sofort stattfinden sollen. Wenn es Gott aber gerade—zum Heile des Menschen—um den Fortschritt in der Offenbarung geht, dann hätte es eine solche sofortige Offenbarung des ganzen Heiles nach Irenäus gar nicht geben können.

Innerhalb der Schöpfungslehre äussert sich Irenäus sehr kritisch zur platonischen Lehre von der Erschaffung der Welt aus einer bereits existierenden Materie. Er sagt hierzu, daß die Gnostiker ihre Lehre von den Emanationen dieser platonischen Theorie entnommen haben,[37] und daß sie deshalb viele Heiden, die Gott nicht kennen (und das sind nach Irenäus gerade die Philosophen), mit ihren Lehren verführen können.[38] Der Einwand des Irenäus gegen diese Lehre ist, daß sie Gott menschliche Schwäche zuschreibt. Der menschliche Künstler kann ja auch nur aus einer bereits existierenden Materie erschaffen.[39]—Denselben Einwand erhebt er gegen die gnostische Lehre von den *aeones*, die als Vorbilder dieser Welt gelten. Diese gnostische Lehre findet nach Irenäus ihren Ursprung in der platonischen Ideenlehre.[40] Hiermit stellen die Gnostiker den Schöpfer als ein Kind dar, das das Erschaffen noch lernen muß.[41] Dem hält Irenäus ent-

---

wichtige Thema der Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts liegt außerhalb des Rahmens dieses Aufsatzes, vgl. dazu Y. de Andia, *Homo vivens. Incorruptibilité et divinisation de l'homme selon Irénée de Lyon*, Paris 1986, SS 127 ff.

[36] 4,38,1: ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς μὲν οἷός τε ἦν παρασχεῖν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ τέλειον, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἀδύνατος λαβεῖν αὐτό· νήπιος γὰρ ἦν.

[37] *Adv. Haer.* 2,14,4: Et hoc autem quod ex subiecta materia dicunt Fabricatorem fecisse mundum, et Anaxagoras et Empedocles et Plato primi ante hos dixerunt.

[38] *Adv. Haer.* 2,2,4: Sit fortasse hic sermo suasorius sive seductorius apud eos qui ignorant eum et hominibus adsimilant eum inopibus et his qui non possunt statim aliquid ex parato fabricare, sed indigentibus multis organis ad eorum fabricationem.

[39] *Adv. Haer.* 2,10,4: Adtribuere enim substantiam eorum quae facta sunt virtuti et voluntati eius qui est omnium Deus et credibile et acceptabile et constans . . . quoniam homines quidem de nihilo non possunt aliquid facere sed de materia subiacenti, Deus autem quam homines hoc primo melior eo quod materiam fabricationis suae cum ante non esset ipse adinvenit, vgl. hierzu G. May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts. Die Entstehung der Lehre von der creatio ex nihilo*, Berlin/New York 1978, SS 174f., J. Fantino, La création *ex nihilo* chez saint Irénée. Étude historique et théologique, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (76) 1992, insbesondere SS 433 ff.

[40] *Adv. Haer.* 2,14,3: Quod autem dicunt imagines esse haec eorum quae sunt sursum, manifestissime Democriti et Platonis sententiam edisserunt . . . quos isti sequentes, figuras illius (sc. Platonis) et exemplum imagines eorum quae sunt sursum vocaverunt . . .

[41] *Adv. Haer.* 2,7,5: . . . quemadmodum nullius momenti artifex et quasi primum discens puer de alienis archetypis transtulit . . .

gegen, daß der Schöpfer das Vorbild der Welt aus sich selbst heraus entworfen hat.[42] Gott hat das Vorbild der Dinge, die erschaffen worden sind, aus sich selbst genommen.[43] Die Übereinstimmung mit der im Schulplatonismus (auch bei Atticus vorliegenden) geläufigen Lehre von den Ideen als den Gedanken des Schöpfers ist u.E. offensichtlich.[44]

Atticus ist nicht nur der Meinung, daß die Welt einen zeitlichen Anfang hat, sondern auch, daß sich das Schöpfungshandeln des Demiurgen in der Zeit vollzieht. Der Demiurg hat ihmzufolge *zunächst* das Vorbild der Welt, die er erschaffen will und wird, erdacht, und *nachdem* die Dinge diesem angeglichen.[45] Erstere These teilt Irenäus, weil sie die gnostische Leugnung der guten Schöpfung widerlegt, letztere aber nicht, weil sie die gnostische Lehre gerade unterstützen könnte. Gegen die gnostische Lehre von den Emanationen, die sich nach dem Verständnis des Irenäus in der Zeit vollziehen, stellt er ausdrücklich fest, daß die Konzeption der Welt im Geiste Gottes und ihre Erschaffung koinzidieren.[46] Er schließt sich der von den

---

[42] *Adv. Haer.* 2,7,5: fixerimus sensum in ... unum Deum qui a semetipso fecit ea quae facta sunt, vgl. 2,2,4: ... ipse in semetipso secundum id quod est inenarrabile nobis omnia praedestinans fecit quemadmodum voluit ...

[43] *Adv. Haer.* 2,16,3: ... ipse a semetipso exemplum et figurationem eorum quae facta sunt accipiens ... (vgl. 2,16,1), vgl. 4,20,1: ... ipse a semetipso substantiam creaturarum et exemplum factorum et figuram in mundo ornamentorum accipiens.

[44] Siehe Atticus, Fragm. 9,5: ταὐτὸν δή, τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ νοήματα πρεσβύτερα τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰ τῶν γενομένων παραδείγματα, ἀσώματα καὶ νοητά, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα ἀεί,—siehe zu dieser mittelplatonischen Lehre die von W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, Berlin/Zürich 1964², Vorwort, angeführte Literatur.—G. May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts*, S 172, bezweifelt, ob es sich hier um eine Anlehnung an die mittelplatonische Lehre von den Ideen als den Gedanken Gottes handelt, da nach Irenäus ja auch die Materie aus Gott selbst heraus erschaffen worden ist, damit aber kaum gemeint sein kann, daß die Materie in Gott präexistent war. Da Irenäus in diesem Zusammenhang die Terminologie verwendet, die er auch bei seiner Widergabe der Lehre Platons gebraucht, will er u.E. tatsächlich suggerieren, daß Platon es mit seiner Ideenlehre hier besser gesehen hat als die Gnostiker, die ihm ihre Thesen entnommen haben. Ob oder wie diese Ideen ewig in Gott sind oder sein können, diese Frage stellt Irenäus sich offenbar nicht. Es sei auch darauf hingewiesen, daß Irenäus den bekannten, auch bei Atticus vorliegenden, Vergleich mit einem Architekten oder Baumeister für Gott verwendet, der nach einem Plan ein Haus baut,—siehe *Adv. Haer.* 2,11,1: ... is qui est super omnia Deus ... Verbo fabricavit quemadmodum ipse voluit, cum sit omnium Fabricator, ut sapiens architectus, vgl. Atticus, Fragm. 4,13, vgl. hierzu F. Ohly, Art. 'Haus (Metapher)', *RAC (13)*, Sp 925f.

[45] Atticus, Fragm. 9,5: Νοήσας (ὁ Πλάτων) γὰρ θεὸν πρὸς αὐτὰ τῶν ἁπάντων πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν καὶ δεσπότην καὶ κηδεμόνα, καὶ γνωρίζων ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τὸν τεχνίτην *πρότερον* νοῆσαι τοῦτο *ἃ μέλλει δημιουργήσειν, εἶθ' οὕτω* τῷ νοηθέντι κάτοπιν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων προσάγειν τὴν ὁμοιότητα.

[46] *Adv. Haer.* 1,12,2: ὃς ἅμα τῷ ἐννοηθῆναι καὶ ἐπιτετέλεκε τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐνενοήθη, 2,3,2: ... simul enim ac mente concepit Deus, et factum est hoc quod mente conceperat.

meisten Platonikern vertretenen Lehre an, in Gott gäbe es kein Früher und Später.[47] Wie sich die These, daß das Schöpfungshandeln Gottes über die Zeit erhaben ist, mit der Lehre vom zeitlichen Anfang der Welt in Einklang bringen läßt, die Frage hat der *ad hoc* argumentierende Irenäus sich offenbar nicht gestellt.[48] Die Frage, ob es vor der Welt Zeit gegeben hat und Zeit geben konnte, wird von Irenäus nicht erörtert. Atticus muß sich zu dieser Frage wohl äußern und stellt die These auf, es habe vor der Welt, vor dem Kosmos, die Zeit des Chaos, d.h. der ungeordneten Bewegung, gegeben. Nach der Erschaffung der Welt gibt es die Zeit des Kosmos, d.h. der geordneten Bewegung.[49] Mit dieser These kann Atticus seine Lehre vom zeitlichen Schöpfungshandeln Gottes mit dem *Timäus* in Einklang bringen, in dem es bekanntlich heißt, daß die Zeit mit der Welt geworden ist.[50]

Die Bedeutung des Vorangehenden zum Verständnis der Theologie des Irenäus sollte freilich nicht überschätzt werden. Es sollte nicht der Schluß gezogen werden, daß Irenäus ein Theologe mit einem platonischen Vorverständnis war, und daß er den Versuch macht, den überlieferten christlichen Glauben in einer Weise zu interpretieren, die seinen platonischen Voraussetzungen entpricht. Es kan lediglich festgestellt werden, daß er—wie auch Justin—Platon für weniger verwerflich hält als die anderen griechischen Philosophen, und daß seiner Meinung nach Platon eine weniger geringe partielle Erkenntnis der Wahrheit hatte als die anderen Philosophen, namentlich als die gottlosen Epikureer. So kann seine Philosophie, wie Irenäus sie aus dem zeitgenössischen Platonismus gekannt hat, gegen die Gnostiker ausgespielt werden. Erasmus hatte grundsätzlich recht, als er feststellte, daß die Gnostiker—wenigstens im Verständnis des Irenäus—von der Philosophie beeinflußt waren, und daß Irenäus sie mit ihren eigenen

---

[47] *Adv. Haer.* 2,13,8: ... in eo autem qui sit super omnes Deus ... neque aliud antiquius, neque posterius aut aliud anterius habente in se ...

[48] Augustin wird versuchen, zu zeigen, wie man sowohl von einem überzeitlichen Schöpfungshandeln Gottes als auch von einem zeitlichen Anfang der Welt sprechen kann, vgl. dazu u.a. J.C.M. van Winden, *Arche. A Collection of Patristic Studies by J.C.M. van Winden. Edited by* J. den Boeft and D.T. Runia, Leiden/New York/Köln 1997, SS 133f.

[49] Siehe die Mitteilung von Proclus *In Timaeum* 28B, ... Ἀττικὸς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί ... φασι ... εἶναι ... πρὸ τῆς κοσμοποιίας ἄτακτον κίνησιν, ἅμα δὲ κινήσει πάντως ἐστὶ καὶ χρόνος, ὥστε καὶ χρόνον εἶναι πρὸ τοῦ παντός· ἅμα δὲ τῷ παντὶ γεγονέναι χρόνον, ἀριθμὸν ὄντα τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κινήσεως, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἦν τῆς πρὸ τῆς κοσμοποιίας οὔσης ἀτάκτου κινήσεως ἀριθμός, 37D/E: ... λέγουσιν οἱ περὶ Ἀττικόν, ὅτι χρόνος μὲν ἦν πρὸ οὐρανοῦ γενέσεως, τεταγμένος δὲ χρόνος οὐκ ἦν.

[50] *Timäus* 38B: Χρόνος δ' οὖν μετ' οὐρανοῦ γέγονεν.

Waffen schlagen will.[51] In seinem Ermessen bietet der Platonismus solche vorzüglichen Waffen. N. Brox hat ebenfalls recht, wenn er sagt, daß Irenäus seiner Tendenz und Herkunft nach kein Philosoph war. Wenn er fortfährt, daß Irenäus Bildung und Kultur zwar nicht abgelehnt hat, sie aber auch nicht besonders geschätzt und genutzt hat,[52] so steht die Bedeutung des Wortes 'besonders' hier zu Debatte. Irenäus hatte vom Platonismus vielleicht doch eine größere Kenntnis als eine nur auf Lektüre doxographischen Materials beruhende. Irenäus hat sich tatsächlich, wie Brox abschließend zu diesem Thema feststellt, aus zweierlei Gründen auf dieses Thema bezogen, nämlich um sie polemisch und um sie defensiv einzusetzen.[53] Bei dem Platonismus hat er sich doch mit einigem Interesse nach polemisch und defensiv brauchbaren Thesen umgesehen.

NL 2343 TX *Oegstgeest*, Ridderspoorlaan 103

[51] Siehe E.P. Meijering, Bemerkungen zum Nachleben des Irenäus im Streit der Konfessionen, *Vig. Christ.* 1999 (53), S 76, Anm. 7.

[52] Art. 'Irenaeus von Lyon', *RAC (18)*, Sp 832.

[53] Sp 833.

LOVE OF ENEMIES AND RECAPITULATION

BY

ERIC OSBORN

The idea of recapitulation dominates the theology of the second century. Adumbrated by Justin, it is expounded endlessly by Irenaeus[1] and given decisive place in Tertullian. Clement of Alexandria takes the important step of uniting it to the Platonic *nous* so that Christian theology becomes biblical and Platonic without a break (*strom.*4.25.156f.). The complexity of the concept is formidable. At least ten ideas (redemption, perfection, inauguration and consummation; totality, economy (saving history) and Christus Victor; ontology, epistemology and ethics (or being, truth and goodness) are combined with the root idea of unification in different permutations.[2] Are all these ideas necessary to the concept? They are an understatement because everything that God does is part of his economy and every part of his economy is defined in relation to its recapitulation. So Irenaeus speaks of the message of the prophets: 'And all the other *economies of his recapitulation*, some they saw through visions, others they announced by word, while others they indicated typically by action (*haer.*4.20.8)'. Redemption (or correction), perfection and inauguration are inseparable from being (or life), truth and goodness. We may distinguish redemption and perfection and see Irenaeus as trying to bridge two different concepts; but it is certain that Irenaeus does not keep them apart.[3]

Consummation is tied to inauguration. The other three ideas are of

---

[1] Irenaeus should be approached from the background of Norbert Brox, *Irenaeus von Lyon*, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Lieferung 142, col. 820-854, and Jacques Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée* (Paris, 1994).

[2] I have given an account in *The beginning of Christian philosophy* (Cambridge, 1981), 163-205, 'The logic of recapitulation' in *Plëroma*, FS Antonio Orbe, ed. E. Romero-Pose (Santiago de Compostela, 1990), 321-35, and in *The emergence of Christian theology* (Cambridge, 1993), 142-72. Each time I tackled the problem, it seemed necessary to add another variable.

[3] At some points he does not even differentiate between redemption and perfection or fulfilment. e.g., see N. Brox, *Offenbarung, Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenaeus von*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

different orders: economy (the coherent history of salvation) is the concept which depends on recapitulation for its coherence and which defines the place of the central event. Some would rank it higher in Irenaeus' theology than recapitulation. Totality is simply an aspect of economy which is applicable to the other different variables because God contains all things and is not himself contained. Christus Victor is one of the persistent images which are used sometimes to tie the logic of recapitulation together.[4] It is hard to make sense of recapitulation without any of the ten variables and the root idea with their differing relationships. Recapitulation cannot be reduced to a rhetorical metaphor, for the summing up in Christ is not the same as repeating main headings. Christ's summing up is ontological *in seipso* as well as an abbreviation *in compendio*.

Two problems are evident. First, we are left with an idea which was meant to simplify[5] and to unify soteriology, but which demands a high degree of conceptual stamina.[6] Second, there is a danger that, worn down by the mass of material, we may miss key elements. One way forward is to look for a salient point which does not encumber or evacuate the content, but may freshly illuminate.

This essay began as an attempt to examine one such point which was either a verbal chance or a way to fresh insight. The word *recapitulare* or ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι is used in NT and elsewhere in Christian literature in two distinct ways. It describes the ontological perfection of all being in Christ (Eph. 1:10). It describes the ethical perfection of all law in the love command (Rom. 13:9f.). Is there any relation between these two applications (ontological and ethical) of the word? The answer, if any, should lie in Irenaeus who quotes Rom. 13:10 to the effect that love is the *pleroma* of the law.[7] Closely related is the Sermon on the Mount which talks about fulfilment as the work (ontological) of Christ and as the perfection (ethical)

Lyon (Salzburg und München, 1966), 186-9. If we separate the different elements of the complex and retain the idea of recapitulation for one of them, the complexity remains under different names.

[4] Another is the tree of paradise and the tree of the cross.

[5] For Irenaeus and Tertullian the gospel is nothing if not simple.

[6] Recapitulation serves Irenaeus as 'the righteousness of God' serves Paul. Käsemann's elucidation of this concept, where he uses the concept of 'power' to crack eight antitheses is convincing and accessible to readers with conceptual stamina. 'Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus', in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 2 (Göttingen, 1965), 181-193. ET 'The righteousness of God' in Paul, *New Testament Questions of Today* (London, 1969), 168-182.

[7] He does not quote Rom. 13:9 where ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι is used.

required of his followers.[8] Jesus' correction and perfection of OT law culminates in the distinctive love of the disciples which reflects the divine perfection of the father in heaven. Mt. 5:45 is cited at least five times 'Be ye perfect as your father in heaven is perfect!' The two ideas (ontological perfection and ethical perfection) are juxtaposed in two passages: *haer.*3.18-3.20 and *haer.*4.13-16, 20.

The way to establish this claim is to analyse these two segments of complex argument, where the two ideas interact. Some hope springs from the effectiveness of analysis in other areas. Two widely misinterpreted claims of Tertullian ('What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?' 'Credible because inept') were commonly given meanings which were incoherent with much that Tertullian wrote. The alleged alienation of Athens and Jerusalem is incompatible with Tertullian who leans more heavily on classical authors than do other early Christian writers. Anti-rationalism is equally incompatible with the argumentative work of one whose favourite word was *ratio.* When the extended context of Tertullian's claims was analysed, in each case, the common meanings were disproved and the incoherence disappeared.[9]

Irenaeus is more difficult to analyse than Tertullian because his prose is loaded with imagery. Like the poet John Keats, he believes that the artist should 'load every rift of your subject with ore'.[10] Yet the progression of argument and the flow of images are always accessible and provide a way into an elusive mind. Irenaeus is close to Justin, for whom the words of scripture had authority because they were marked by πνεῦμα, δύναμις, χάρις. From them grace gushes forth like living water from the rock of Christ (*dial.*7.1; 9.1).[11] Irenaeus differs from Tertullian who generally uses straight argument and from Clement of Alexandria who intersperses more straight argument with his symbolism.

An analysis is neither a summary nor a paraphrase. It does not list information, but indicates a movement which logically links a series of propositions and a succession of images. This movement is clearer in Tertullian where argument pleads a case than in Irenaeus where the images can be excessive.

---

[8] See the magisterial essay 'Fulfilment-words in the New Testament: use and abuse' in C.F.D. Moule, *Essays in New Testament interpretation* (Cambridge, 1982).

[9] See my Tertullian, *First theologian of the West* (Cambridge, 1997), chapters two and three.

[10] Letter to Percy Bysshe Shelley, Hampstead 1820. A letter from Shelley (Pisa, July 27, 1820) to Keats later speaks of the poem *Endymion* which contains 'treasures poured forth with indistinct profusion'.

[11] See the perceptive analysis of J.C.M. van Winden, *An early Christian philosopher* (Leiden, 1971), 116-24.

Justin provides the key to understanding Irenaeus and Clement. After a philosophical journey which ended in Plato, he turned to the prophets and found in them the only safe and useful philosophy. They had direct access to truth and their utterances and visions replaced the Platonic forms with prophetic perceptions of God. The scriptures display the mind of God. For Clement the true dialectic divides and joins scripture to reach the highest knowledge; symbols are the medium of truth. Similarly for Irenaeus, the proof of the kerygma is less in the literal fulfilment of predicted happenings than in the striking impressions of their images. After all the rich symbols of Moses, David, Isaiah and other prophets, Irenaeus ends the *Epideixis* with the magic of Baruch 3:29-4:1: 'He that sends forth light and it goes and he has called it and it obeyed him with fear; and the stars will shine in their watches and are glad. He called them and they said: here we are; with cheerfulness they have shone forth to him that made them. This is our God and no other shall be taken into account with him. He found out all the way by understanding, and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel his beloved. Afterwards he was seen on earth and conversed with men'.

Another distinctive quality of second century exegesis is rumination. The study of scripture is a chewing of the cud. As Irenaeus (*haer.*5.8.3) and Clement (*strom.*7.18.109.2) point out, Jews and heretics are unclean animals because the former chew the cud of scripture but do not part the hoof (acknowledge both father and son), while the latter part the hoof but do not chew the cud. The Christian chews the cud of scripture and parts the hoof in his faith in both father and son.

The ruminant exegete penetrates further into the mind of his major sources (Paul, John and Matthew) than later text-collectors are permitted to appreciate. Indeed Clement explains at the peak of the Stromateis (*strom.*7.18.109.2) that he draws everything from the sense (τὸν νοῦν) of scripture but is not going to quote texts literally (τὴν λέξιν). This is unfair to later interpreters, but reasonable to those who, like Paul, possess the mind of Christ, and like Justin hold scriptures to be the mind and will of God. It is worth noting that Tertullian never quotes Colossians 2:9 (he does quote 2:8) although his entire case against philosophy is built on it and that Irenaeus quotes emphatically Rom. 13:10 but never Rom. 13:9 which includes the one word which dominates his theology. Of course, Irenaeus quotes more texts than most readers can handle and they demand investigation.[12] The important thing is that they are for rumination.

---

[12] As in the valuable work of R. Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret* (Tübingen, 1994).

We may be confident that, while *Christus recapitulans* is explicit in Ephesians only, the themes which unite Irenaeus' ruminant theology will be fundamental to the theology of Paul, John and the Synoptics. A common theme of these writers is love as perfected in the father in heaven and in the son on the cross, and as required of those who follow the son into the glory of the godhead. This gives the theology of Irenaeus an ethical strength and coherence which would commend it to the thoughtful pagan. Love was a cosmic principle for Platonists. For the Stoics, humans were members one of another and the world was one city of which all were citizens.

The scope of this essay is the interaction of ethical recapitulation (perfect goodness) and ontological recapitulation (being, life, incorruption, glory).[13] Did Irenaeus see the love of enemies and the recapitulation of all things in Christ as converging in the supreme act of salvation? Is the centre of recapitulation to be found where Jesus says 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'?

Redemption, Perfection and Inauguration: from Ontology to Ethics (*haer.*3.18-20)

Book 3 falls into two main parts:[14] the first part (6-15) expounds the unicity of God. The second part (16-23) expounds the unicity of Christ, the son of God made man in order to sum up his own creation, under three theses: Jesus is truly man, truly God and true renewer of Adam. *Haer.* 3.18-20 bridges the first and second claims, declaring Christ to be true man and true God. Recapitulation has both ontological and ethical consequences. It changes reality with a new creation and it changes man's morality from servitude to sonship. The movement is from theology to ethics and shows that for Irenaeus the centre of each is identical: forgiving love, which redeems and perfects mankind upon the cross. In the words of the man Jesus ('Father, forgive them'), the divine image is perfected and restored in mankind. The same words express the perfect goodness of the father in heaven who sends his sun and rain on good and evil men alike. His sovereign love is not conditioned by the moral frailty of those who benefit. The supreme ethical act of love is needed to transform man

[13] Irenaeus does not use the terms 'ethics' and 'ontology' as does Clement of Alexandria, who speaks (*strom.*4.25.162.5) of ὁ ἠθικὸς τόπος and of ὁ φυσικὸς τόπος but they provide clear summaries of the way he handles the varieties of goodness and being.

[14] Following A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, *Contre les hérésies*, 3, 2 (Paris, 1974), SC 211, 493-5. See also 3, 1 (SC210), 190-205.

ontologically from death to life. The argument moves from life (ontology) to love to the ethics of sonship.

From death to life

Irenaeus begins with a well-known statement of recapitulation. The word was in the beginning with God, was always present to the human race, then at a time fixed by the father, finally joined his creation to himself by becoming a man who was capable of suffering. For Irenaeus, as a general principle (*haer.*3.25.5), beginning, middle and end are all important for the divine economy.[15] The son was always with the father. The long history of man was summed up by Christ briefly in himself, who gave an epitome of salvation to provide an inclusive recovery and a new beginning for mankind: what was lost in Adam, God's image and likeness, may now be recovered in Christ: *sed quando incarnatus et homo factus, longam hominum expositionem in seipso recapitulavit, in compendio nobis salutem praestans, ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus* (*haer.*3.18.1). From the beginning the saving work of Christ has ontological and ethical consequences in that it has to do with life and with goodness. The image of God meant life and goodness to which the sin of man brought death and moral corruption. It was open to fallen man neither to be remade nor to receive salvation; but the word of God did both for him, through his incarnation and death which completed the economy of salvation (*haer.*3.18.2).

Love crucified

For Irenaeus (as for Paul and John), this happened in the death of Christ. Irenaeus quotes Romans 10, where salvation comes to him who confesses Jesus as crucified and risen lord.[16] He died and rose to be lord of the dead and the living. Christ crucified is the sum of Paul's proclamation. The cup of blessing is communion in his blood.[17] Christ's death brought together those who were far away (Eph. 2:13), freed those who were under the curse

---

[15] Both Irenaeus (*haer.*3.25.5) and Clement of Alexandria (*str.*2.22.132) quote Plato *Laws*, 715f. for this point.

[16] See E. Käsemann, *The Spirit and the Letter, Perspectives on Paul* (London, 1971), 155-168, ET of *Geist und Buchstabe, Paulinische Perspektive* (Tübingen, 1969) 267-285, where Rom. 10:5-13 is taken as a test case.

[17] Rom. 10:6-10 and 14:9,15; 1 Cor. 1:23 and 10:16 and 15:3f., 12,21. 'Après *quelques lignes très denses relatives au pourquoi de cette incarnation*, voici de nouveaux textes de Paul dans lequels celui-ci répète inlassablement que le Christ en personne a souffert la

of the law (Gal. 3:13) and transformed their relationship with others for whom Christ died (1 Cor. 8:11). There never was an impassible Christ, as heretics claim. The sovereign good of crucified love is necessary to transform man's ontology from death to life. The son of God became son of man which is why he is called Christ. The name of Christ includes the notion of trinity: there must be a father to anoint, a son to be anointed and a spirit who is the divine unction (*haer.*3.18.3).

When Christ speaks of the necessity that the disciple's cross should follow his, we have the second link of the ontological with the ethical. Love crucified must be repeated in the disciple who takes up his cross and follows, losing his life in order to find it (*haer.*3.18.4). His confession points to yet another consummation where Christ will confess those who have confessed him. 'They try to follow the footsteps of the passion of the Lord and to be martyrs of him who was passible.' *et secundum hoc conantur vestigia adsequi passionis Domini, passibilis (sc. Christi) martyres facti* (*haer.*3.18.5). Those who despise the martyrs will be rejected by the same Christ who receives the martyrs into glory (*haer.*3.18.5). Existence under the cross, manifest in the martyr, is the central mystery.

Goodness and truth

The ultimacy of the cross displays the ethical ultimacy of love. *Et ex hoc quod Dominus in cruce dixerit.* The reconciling act is declared in 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'. These words mark a new epoch: he who taught the forgiveness of enemies now puts into practice his precept.[18] Here he reveals his long suffering, patience, mercy and goodness. The word of God who told us to love our enemies and pray for those who hate us, *ipse hoc fecit in cruce, in tantum diligens humanum genus.* If there were an alternative Christ who avoided the cross, we should prefer without hesitation the one who suffered and who bore no grudge against those who did evil to him. He is truly good (*haer.*3.18.5).

Truth and goodness must go together. If Christ did not really suffer we have nothing for which to thank him *si enim non passus est, nulla gratia ei,* and much for which to blame him. For he told us that we should suffer gladly by turning the other cheek, but he himself (heretics claim) avoided the painful consequences of this injunction. A non-suffering Christ would

---

Passion, a été suspendu au bois, a versé son sang, est mort, a été enseveli et est resuscité.' A. Rousseau. L. Doutreleau, SC210, 194.

[18] 'Tout cela exclut la thèse hérétique d'un "Christ" demeuré étranger à la Passion'. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, SC210, 195.

be inferior to his followers. Further, unless his obedience has really replaced our disobedience, sin has not been destroyed. But our lord is the one true master and is truly good,[19] fighting and defeating the devil, redeeming disobedience by his obedience, freeing his own creation and destroying sin. All this he did out of supreme goodness and love *est enim piissimus et misericors dominus et amans humanum genus* (*haer.*3.18.6). The spring of recapitulation is ultimate goodness.

Ultimate goodness cannot lack truth. Human salvation depended on the truth of the incarnation, where man was joined to God. A man had to overthrow man's enemy for the victory to be real and God had to give salvation for the gift to be permanent. Only a real union of God and man could enable man to share in incorruption. This final union consists of love and friendship. The mediator of God and man had to be related to both parties 'in order to bring each into friendship and concord and to ensure that God should welcome man and man should offer himself to God' (*haer.*3.18.7).[20] Salvation comes because the same exuberant love comes from God and from man and joins the two together. Those who deny the reality of Christ's incarnation, which embodies this communion, are still under the sway of sin and death. What appeared to be the case was real (*hoc et erat*). In recapitulation God joined himself to the humanity he had of old created so that sin and death might be destroyed and man brought to life. This could not have been effective unless it were real: *et propter hoc vera opera eius* (*haer.*3.18.7).

Inauguration and filial freedom

The doctrine of recapitulation claims that Christ is the end beyond which nothing can be imagined. The finality of total fulfilment reverberates on every retrospective page. However recapitulation is as much a beginning as it is an end, for from the true and perfect work of Christ flow new life and freedom for the children of the father; each new day may be lived as if it were the first day of creation. Prospect replaces retrospect. Just as it was only possible for man to be delivered from sin by one who was truly the son of man so it is only possible for man to gain freedom and life eternal through one who was truly son of God and word of the father (*haer.*3.19.1).[21]

---

[19] Sed quoniam solus vere magister Dominus noster, et bonus vere Filius Dei et patiens, Verbum Dei Patris filius hominis factus. *haer.*3.18.6.

[20] per suam ad utrosque domesticitatem in amicitiam et concordiam utrosque reducere, et facere ut et Deus adsumeret hominem et homo se dederet Deo.

[21] Ibid., 197. On 'exchange formulae' *Tauschformeln*, see A. Bengsch, *Heilsgeschichte und*

Those who say that Jesus was merely a man are left behind in the slavery of ancient disobedience (*haer.*3.19.1). They have not been mingled (*commixti*) with the word of God the father, nor have they any share in the freedom which only the son of God can give. 'If the son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed' (Jn. 8:36). Despising Emmanuel who was born of the virgin, they deprive themselves of his gift which is life eternal; not receiving the divine word of incorruption, they remain in mortal flesh; not taking the antidote of life (*antidotum vitae*), they are obligated to death. The Word tells them of his 'gift of grace: I said "You are gods and sons of the most high God; but you die as men"' (Ps. 81:6f.). These words are addressed to those who do not accept the free gift of sonship, who despise the incarnation by pure nativity of the word of God, who deprive man of his ascent to God and display ingratitude to the word of God made flesh for them. The reason for the incarnation of the word of God, was that man might be mixed (*commixtus*) with the word of God, receive the gift of adoption and become a son of God. This is argued in a strong form of a 'physical' redemption theory. Our mortality is absorbed in the immortality of the word of God and our corruption is overcome by his incorruption (1 Cor. 15:53f., 2 Cor. 5:4), and we become sons of God by adoption (*haer.*3.19.1; fr.gr.28). All of which follows on from the truth of the incarnation: our freedom, sonship and life eternal are only possible because the son of God was truly made son of man. The mystery of his incarnation, his humility and majesty, is declared in many passages of scripture (*haer.*3.19.2). Reciprocally, man is absorbed in the victory, patience, kindness, resurrection and ascension of his lord (*haer.*3.19.3; fr.gr.29). The Christian prospect has the same infinity which characterises love and grace because it comes from the forgiving love of the cross.

This is why the lord himself, surpassing our hopes, gave us a sign which was profound and exalted, the sign of Emmanuel, descending to the depths and rising to the heights, taking with him his humanity, so that the rest of the body might follow its risen head.[22] As there are many members in the body, so there are many mansions with the father (*haer.*3.19.3).

Heilswissen (Leipzig, 1957), 157f. The place of exchange formulae in Irenaeus has been commonly noticed. It may be linked with Pauline love of antithesis or John's dialectic of light and dark where the ultimate glory shines from the cross.

[22] 'La prophétie de l'Emmanuel englobe, dans un raccourci grandiose la totalité du mystère redempteur'. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, SC 210, 195.

All of which springs from God's magnanimity which foresaw already an answer to human sin in the victory of the Word. He displayed his kindness and magnificent power, as ever in antithesis, his strength made perfect in human weakness. From the hopelessness of Jonah[23] in the belly of the whale, man rises from the dead to glorify God, and goes on without interruption, glorifying God to whom alone he owes the salvation of his flesh which had no natural resemblance to God.[24] Man must never claim to be incorrupt by nature, for this would miss the entire point of his salvation. Ungrateful pride blinds man to the divine love and dignity (*haer.*3.20.1). Rather, he must live in perpetual gratitude for the love of God, loving God all the more because God has forgiven him so much (Lk. 7:42f.). His mortal weakness is set against the immortal power of God who gives immortality to the mortal and eternity to creatures of time. The glory of man is God and man is but the receptacle of God's work of wisdom and power. Just as a doctor proves his power among the sick, so God is displayed in the feebleness of man.

Yet love does not end, for man goes on, abiding in love (*manens in dilectione eius*), subjection and gratitude for God's grace, to receive greater glory until he becomes like the one who died for him. He who took flesh to condemn sin and expel it from the flesh (Rom. 8:3)[25] moreover (*autem*) goes further and calls man on to divine likeness (Eph. 5:1) lifting him into the realm of the father and giving him the grace to see and lay hold of God.[26] For the word of God dwelt in man for no other reason than to accustom man to receive God and accustom God to receive man (*haer.*3.20.2).[27]

---

[23] The sign of Jonah complements the sign of Emmanuel. *Insperabilis* man receives an *insperabilis* salvation.

[24] In the *Epideixis*, man has a physical resemblance to God. Irenaeus has different accounts of divine image and likeness in humanity.

[25] En s'unissant à la chair de péché et en vivant dans l'obéissance jusqu'à la mort, le fils de Dieu a comme épuisé la résistance de cette chair devant l'amour divin, a refait dans l'homme l'adhésion à Dieu, a rétabli en lui l'attitude filiale. R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon Saint Irénée de Lyon* (Münster, 1978), 141.

[26] 'Irenäus überrascht oft durch seine kühnen Formulierungen. Seine Tendenz im Umgang mit technisch prägnanten Tertmini is nicht die der vorbehaltenden Einengung im Gebrauch *sondern die einer möglichst weitreichenden Ausdehnung der Anwendbarkeit*'. N. Brox, *Offenbarung, Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenaeus von Lyon* (Salzburg und München, 1966), 106.

[27] A frequent idea in Irenäeus. The son (*haer.*4.12.4) and the spirit (*haer.*3.17.1) experience the same process and even 'Satan hat sich bereits am Anfang an sein Geschäft der Lüge gewöhnt' (*haer.*5.23.1). N. Brox, *opus cit.*, 106.

The good thing which is our salvation is not from ourselves but from God alone *quoniam non a nobis sed a deo est bonum salutis nostrae* (*haer.*3.20.3). Paul said this best, when he denied any goodness to his flesh and in his misery looked for someone to deliver him from death. He found the answer in the grace of Jesus Christ our lord (Rom. 7:18,24f.). All is of grace. We find comfort in God himself who comes to our need and saves us (Is.35:3f.).[28]

Conclusion

The movement of Irenaeus' argument (from death to life, love crucified, goodness and truth, inauguration of filial freedom) is intricate but clear. Because Christ is true man and true God, he sums up and renews humanity. This he does on the cross when he forgives his enemies out of infinite love. This is the keystone of recapitulation. The cross has to be true and without pretence of any kind. Goodness and truth are joined, else the love of the cross could not be effective in the continuing life of the martyrs and other Christians. On the cross God becomes man and man becomes God as he displays divine forgiveness; in the union of God and man, man is brought to life. The new life is a life of freedom because limitless grace is confirmed by the signs of Emmanuel God-with-us, of Jesus our head to whom we are joined and Jonah whose salvation sprang from hopelessness. Goodness, truth, life, freedom are ours because we are sons of the forgiving father and *quoniam non a nobis sed a deo est bonum salutis nostrae* which begins from the cross. If we think first of Christ's work of recapitulation we must go back to the infinite goodness of God who brought it about. At the same time we must go forward to infinite grace and the ethical exuberance which it gives. In each case we move from reality to goodness, from ontology to ethics.

Inauguration and Consummation: from Ethics to Ontology (*haer.*4.13-16 and 20)

In the second passage Irenaeus begins from the ethical and ends in the ontological. He moves again through redemption, perfection and the inauguration of the new humanity in Christ to its consummation in divine glory.

---

[28] Book 3 continues (3.21-3) with an account of the new Adam, the new Eve and God's mercy to the fallen Adam. Tatian's denial of this mercy and the folly of those who deny God's providence, justice and goodness, round off the book (3.24f.).

Excessive righteousness and filial freedom

The natural precepts of the law (i.e. the decalogue)[29] antedated the giving of the written law and were kept by the patriarchs who were justified by faith and were pleasing to God. These were not abolished but extended and fulfilled (*implevit*) by Christ. The antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount point to perfection and extension rather than to the opposition which Marcion superficially claims. Entrance into the kingdom is open to those whose righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees. This excess is threefold. They must believe in the son as well as the father for it is the son who unites men to God, they must confirm their words by their action, and they must abstain from evil desires as well as evil acts (*haer.*4.13.1).[30]

The ancient law worked by external commands concerning physical acts to bring about obedience to God. Fulfilment goes deeper. The saving word works by liberating the soul from the body and enabling it freely to purify the body. Following God without chains, the soul acknowledges wider claims and deeper devotion lest it in any way dishonour God who had given freedom. While slaves and children equally obey the master of the house, the latter do it with greater confidence. Freedom brings more glory than does servitude (*haer.*4.13.3). As the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount indicate, enemies must be loved and thieves rewarded. There is more joy in freely giving than in serving under necessity (*gaudeamus, gratiam magis praestantes in proximos quam necessitate servientes*) (*haer.*4.13.3). When compelled to go a mile, we go two miles, not following like a slave but going on in front as a free man, being agreeable and useful (*aptus, utilis*), to the neighbour in all things, and never intending evil to anyone. This means that our goodness is perfect, raised to the divine likeness of the father who sends sunshine and rain on good and evil men alike (Matt. 5:45).

Freedom widens into friendship

All this means not the abolition of the law but its extension and widening. Freedom gives better service, and springs from a fuller submission and love to the one it serves. For freedom does not detach us from our lord but joins us more firmly; indeed no one can find salvation apart from him.

---

[29] The Law is God's *parole* and action through his Word, R. Berthousoz, *Liberté et grâce suivant la théologie d'Irénée de Lyon* (Fribourg, 1980), 161.

[30] Natural precepts of love are radicalised to include the desires of the heart, R. Berthousoz, *opus cit.*, 166.

'Far from conflicting with human freedom, the grace of God is its condition'.[31] The more grace we receive from him, the more we love him, the more we love him the more we receive his glory, as we stand before the father's face (*haer.*4.13.3). Extension is evident when the same natural precepts are begun by 'them' of the old covenant and augmented by 'us' of the new.

To obey God and follow his word, to love him above all and to love one's neighbour as one's self (every man is neighbour to every other man), to abstain from every evil act: these are common to both (Jew and Christian) and point us to the same God who is our lord, the word of God. He first enslaved men to God and then made them his friends and free. He now shares with them whatever the father has said, but slaves remain ignorant of his coming. In calling his disciples 'friends' he shows plainly that he is the same word of God whom Abraham followed freely in the generosity of faith (*voluntarie et sine vinculis propter generositatem sequens*) when he became God's friend (James 2:23; *haer.*4.13.4).

Divine generosity in friendship and glory

God's word (*existens ab initio perfectus*) did not need the friendship of Abraham but in his goodness wanted to give the life eternal which goes with the gift of friendship (*haer.*4.13.4). Indeed when we go back to the first beginning, as necessary for recapitulation, we find that God did not need to make Adam except to have someone to receive his benefits. Before Adam, before creation, the father and the son existed in mutual glory (Jn. 17:5). When in his perfection he calls us to follow, he does not need our service, but wants to save us. 'To follow the saviour is to receive salvation as to follow the light is to be illuminated' (*haer.*4.14.1). When we stand in the light we derive all from the light which derives nothing from us. Our service to God does nothing needful for God; the direction is all the other way. From his abundance, the perfect God gives, to his followers and servants, life, incorruption and eternal glory (*haer.*4.14.1), simply because they follow and serve. God needs nothing; men need communion with God and find glory as the followers of his son. They come from every quarter of the world to receive the glory for which God made them. Like eagles flying in to feast on their prey, they come flocking to share God's glory (*haer.*4.14.1). For this consummation, God in his goodness chose patriarchs, people (sadly unteachable) and prophets to accustom man to carry his spirit. Exuberance

[31] Ibid., 246.

is everywhere; there is nothing economical about the divine economy. Like a divine architect he planned the fabric of salvation so that it fitted together. The prodigal son returned to the symphony of many sounds of salvation in his father's house (Lk. 15:25). In the Apocalypse the voice of many waters points to the great riches of the father (Rev. 1:25) and the way in which the need of every condition is met (*haer.*4.14.2).

The long road to glory

As examples of his way of meeting special needs, tabernacle, temple, Levites, sacrifices, oblations and purification were appropriate for a people with a tendency to that idolatry which the golden calf indicated. God had done well without all these things before the time of Moses and did not need them. Therapeutically and educationally, he gave the law to wean people from things secondary to primary, from figures to reality, from temporal to eternal, carnal to spiritual, earthly to heavenly. Moses spent forty days teaching the people the heavenly truth and future prophecies which lay behind the law. As Paul (1 Cor. 10:11) said, it was all done with mirrors or in types (*haer.*4.14.3).

The discipline of the decalogue was different from all this. It consisted of principles of natural law which had been fixed in every human being from the beginning. Moses added nothing to these primitive precepts which told how God should be obeyed. Jesus told his disciples to follow these laws. When the ancient people lapsed into idolatry, they received the cultic law which enslaved them. Ezekiel (20:24f.) tells how God gave laws which were not good but therapeutic.

As Stephen (Acts 7:38-43) declared, there is only one God and he gave laws which were appropriate at the time (*haer.*4.15.1). Some laws, like that of divorce, were given because of the people's hardness of heart. Even in the New Testament rules were conceded by Paul for those who lacked restraint (1 Cor. 7:5,25). In the same way the cultic law gave regulations to prevent apostasy and to lead on to total love of God (*haer.*4.15.2). They were part of the harmony of the divine purpose to prepare the people for freedom and love.[32] Circumcision, so far from being the summit of righteousness (*consummatrix justitiae*) was simply a sign (Gen. 17:9-11) to make the race of Abraham distinctive and recognisable (*haer.*4.16.1). The commandments

[32] Cf. R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon Saint Irénée de Lyon* (Münster, 1978), 40.

pointed beyond themselves to the need to love God (Deut. 10:12). God lacked nothing; but men lacked the glory which comes from the love and service of God (*haer.*4.16.4).

Reason, love and glory

There is rational restraint on exuberant fantasy. The Gnostics abandon truth for ultimate nonsense, when they claim that our God is but the image of a higher father and that the spiritual things of which we speak are the reflection of a higher Pleroma. Those who forever regress through images of images, types of types never find the true God (*haer.*4.19.1). No one can go beyond God (*haer.*4.19.3) because he is beyond us, greater than we can know (*haer.*4.20.1). Negative theology has this practical outcome.

Love leads us to God through his word and in obedience we learn of his unicity and sovereignty. He made the substance, pattern and totality of things that are (*haer.*4.20.1). His light burst on us in the flesh of his son, from which brilliance comes our immortality (*haer.*4.20.2).[33] In his word who is our Lord Jesus Christ, he became man, joining end to beginning, man to God. This *commixtio et communio* of God and man, predicted from the beginning, meant that men could see and talk with incarnate God, being entirely saved by him, through the physical union of flesh and spirit.[34] Freed from every wicked thing, they can serve him in holiness and righteousness all their days (Lk. 1:71 and 75). Embracing God's spirit, they pass into his splendour (*haer.*4.20.4).

God's kingdom of love

Love has the final word (*haer.*4.20.5). We read that prophets and the pure in heart see God, yet no one can see God and live. While it follows from his greatness and glory that we can never apprehend him, 'his love, kindness and omnipotence grant this vision to those who love him *secundum autem dilectionem et humanitatem et quod omnia possit.* In the kingdom of the father love grants the final vision.[35] All things are possible to God who turns things around so that by the spirit, the son and himself he is seen and bestows eternal life. Just as those who see light are in the light and share its

[33] Tremblay, *opus cit.*, 84.

[34] The mediation of grace through physical encounter is reminiscent of Bar. 3:38 which is the climax of the Epideixis. Cf. Tremblay, *opus cit.*, 159.

[35] See Tremblay, *opus cit.*, 150-3.

splendour, so those who see God are in him and share his splendour. The invisible and incomprehensible God became visible and comprehensible to give life to those who believe and who are joined to him within the bond of mutual love. His infinite greatness takes him away from us; his infinite goodness brings him near. We see him and receive his gift of life. 'Moreover those who see God partake of life' (This is expanded in the Latin, 'the splendour of God gives life; those therefore who see God receive life.')

So ineffable goodness (ἀγαθότης) begins by bypassing inscrutable greatness and granting both the vision of God and the gift of life. Goodness also has the last word because life eternal comes from participation in God and participation is the vision of God and the enjoyment of his goodness (χρηστότης) (*haer.*4.20.6). 'Therefore men will see God, that they may live, being made immortal by that sight and attaining even unto God' (*haer.*4.20.6).

There has been a gradual movement to this crowning act. The one who reveals the father was active from the beginning, doing good in different ways at different times, dispensing the grace of the father in an appropriate way. He preserved the invisibility of God so that there was always something ahead of man's grasp; yet at the same time he revealed enough of God to keep man alive. God's glory is a living man while man's life is the vision of God.[36] The life which comes from God's revelation in his word is a prolific extension of the life which comes from God's manifestation in creation (*haer.*4.20.7). It sums up all the anticipation which the prophets heard, saw and announced. 'And all the other *economies of his recapitulation*, some they saw through visions, others they announced by word, while others they indicated typically by action. Visible signs they saw, audible signs they proclaimed, prophetic actions they performed, but all were announced prophetically' (*haer.*4.20.8). The steps to the invisible God are clear: while from the old covenant to the millennium the word of God is seen and 'as a consequence, the transcendent invisible father is seen in his son', at the end the father is seen directly in his kingdom.[37]

---

[36] This famous sentence, R. Berthousoz points out (*Liberté et grâce suivant la théologie d'Irénée de Lyon* (Fribourg, 1980, 159), is to be understood in its context. 'Dieu qui demeure identique à lui-même, c'est-à-dire constant dans son dessein d'amour et de salut, donne toujours plus à l'homme pour rétablir la communion avec lui . . . Une vie qui lui est donnée par la création et la connaissance de Dieu, une existence qui grandit au rythme des économies, accomplies par le Verbe, dispensateur de la grâce du Père pour le profit des hommes.'

[37] Tremblay, *opus cit.*, 153.

Conclusion

In this section (Excessive righteousness and filial freedom, freedom widens into friendship, divine generosity in friendship and glory, the long road to glory, reason and love and glory, God's kingdom of love), Irenaeus moves from ethics to ontology, from natural law to the glory of God's being. The middle term is the same as in the first section: the infinite love of the father in heaven and of the son who dies on the cross. This remains the keystone of recapitulation. The natural law is not abolished but extended and perfected. Ethics exceeds natural law not by denying the first mile but by going the extra mile, in love and freedom. The new righteousness proliferates in excess by believing in the son as well as the father (because the son joins men to God), and by obeying God in actions as well as words, in desires as well as actions. It perfects goodness by gaining the likeness of God. Freedom under grace brings a closer union than servitude.[38] More grace received means more love is given, which means greater glory so that we gain access to divine reality and stand before the father's face. The friendship of God means to follow him *voluntarie et sine vinculis* in a confidence which answers to the generosity of his gift. All this comes from the overflowing perfection of God's goodness. He did not need Adam except as the recipient of this exuberance. The glory of father and son, which preceded creation, were recapitulated on the cross whence comes the new creation and the light to which all nations come. They gather like eagles from every direction and hear the symphony of salvation and the voice of many waters. The long road to glory ends in the vision of God where infinite goodness comes near in love, light, glory, life and the vision of God. Yet the way from ethics to ontology is clear beyond all ambiguity: love of enemies, exuberant love leads to divine likeness and the discovery of divine reality.

The Unity of Irenaeus' Thought

The above arguments which move from ontology to ethics and from ethics to ontology, from recapitulation to love command and from love command to recapitulation provide a ground bass to the whole symphony of salvation. The work of Christ is a recapitulation of all things, which includes the

[38] R. Berthousoz, indicates the importance of this theme of liberation for later tradition, *opus cit.*, 13, 253.

redemption and perfection of mankind and the inauguration of a new humanity in Christ. God's love is the motive and cause of his saving, perfecting and inaugurating work. As Irenaeus summarises at the beginning of Book 5: 'the word of God, through his immense love became what we are so that he might bring us to be even what he is himself" (*haer.*5 pref). From redemption and perfection follows the new humanity: 'By his own blood has our lord ransomed us, giving his soul for our soul, and his flesh for our flesh, pouring out the spirit of the father to effect the union and communion (*in admunitionem et communionem*) of God and man, bringing (*deponente*) God down to men by means of the spirit, and on the other hand, attaching (*imponente*) man to God by his own incarnation, and giving us immortality firmly and truly through his advent, by means of communion with God' (*haer.*5.1).[39]

The logic of recapitulation which moves from redemption and perfection to inauguration and consummation determines the structure of Irenaeus' thought. When the mechanics of recapitulation, with permutations and combinations of all its variables, becomes wearisome, there is a way of holding Irenaeus' thought together. Love is the ground of the redemption, perfection, inauguration and of the glorious consummation which awaits.

Redemptive love is evident in the words of forgiveness from the cross and the longsuffering, patience, compassion and goodness which it displays in him who loved the human race so much (*haer.*3.18.5). Human nature was perfected in the divine when it conquered, endured and performed acts of kindness. This revealed the sign in the depth below and the height above, Emmanuel, God with us, as the shepherd sought the sheep which was lost (*haer.*3.19.3). When man sinned, God showed himself magnanimous and kind, exhibiting his strength in mans weakness, while the devil obscured the love which God had for man (*haer.*3.20.1). Scripture tells us that the grace of Jesus Christ our lord delivers us, that the lord saves because of his love and that he turns again to have compassion (*haer.*3.20.3,4).

The Sermon on the Mount inaugurates sonship which extends the commandments to demand that we love as God does, being kind to enemies (*haer.*4.13.3). His greatness places him beyond the limits of our knowledge, yet through his love we come to know him (*haer.*4.20.1).

---

[39] Loofs sees *propter immensam dilectionem* (*haer.*5.pref.) as the '*persönliche Frömmigkeit*' and '*persönliches Interesse*' which Irenaeus found in the theology of Asia Minor, but goes on to acknowledge its theological importance against Gnostics and Marcion. F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, 1 (Halle, 1950), 111f.

Redemption is at the same time a restoration to perfection in Christ. In Adam we lost the image and likeness which joined us to God; in Christ that image is restored (*haer.*3.18.1). And it is perfected by his supreme act of love on the cross, which is the centre of our faith (*haer.*3.18.2f.), where his words of forgiveness show him to be a man like God, and where he is linked to the martyrs who take up the cross for him (*haer.*3.18.4).

From his redemption and perfection a new humanity is inaugurated. He joins man and God in friendship and concord, for 'how could we participate in the adoption of sons, unless we had received from God through the son that communion with God himself, unless his word had entered into communion with us by becoming flesh?' In order to destroy sin and redeem man, he perfected man in himself. 'In himself God recapitulated the ancient model which was man, so that he could slay sin, destroy death and vivify man; that is why his works are true' (*haer.*3.18.7). When the son of God became son of man, he received humanity into himself so that men might be adopted into divine sonship (*haer.*3.19.1). The joining of God and man is so close that the body follows the risen head, each of the members joined in its own way (*haer.*3.19.3). Saved from a hopeless condition, like Jonah, man praises and thanks God without ceasing (*haer.*3.20.1). While man glories in God, God glories in man whom he has saved, just as a physician is proved by his patients. Continuing in love and thanksgiving to God, man looks to promotion into the divine likeness (*haer.*3.20.2).

All the details of the divine economy spring from love. Divine grace bestows the gift of adoption and divine sonship on men (*haer.*3.19.1). The gift of incorruption calls for a response of love and gratitude, which grows as feeble man receives more of divine power (*haer.*3.20.2). Intimacy grows as more grace incites man to more love and more love brings more glory in the presence of the father (*haer.*4.13.3). Our lord shares the words of the father with those who are no longer servants but friends. The friendship of God grants immortality to those who are embraced in it (*haer.*4.13.4). The long road from creation to final glory is marked by love. Having first formed man in his own spontaneous bounty, God chose the patriarchs with a view to their salvation, then tried to teach an unteachable people to follow him; at the same time he entrusted his spirit to the prophets so that some men might grow accustomed to life in communion with God (*haer.*4.14.2). God far exceeds human knowledge but because of his love he has become known by his creative word. The same word in the last days became man, so that he might join the end to the beginning, man

to God. Within this relation man receives the spirit of God and passes into the glory of the father (*haer.*4.20.4). Because of the love and kindness and the infinite power of the unknowable God, he grants the impossible gift: that men should see him (*haer.*4.20.5). This is the end of a long line of dispensations where God was revealed to men and man was presented to God, in such a gradual manner that there was always something more of God for men to gain. Yet God was indeed revealed, for without God man would cease to exist. 'For the glory of God is a living man; and the life of man is the vision of God'. The life which comes from God in creation is surpassed by the life which comes from the revelation of the Father through the word (*haer.*4.20.7). 'Love makes man perfect, and he who loves God is perfect both in this world and in that which is to come. For we never cease from loving God, but in proportion as we continue to gaze upon him, so much the more do we love him' (*haer.*4.12.2).

We began from an affirmation (*haer.*3.18.5) of the presence of the divine word on the cross. 'En effet, dans l'attitude de pardon du Crucifié cristallisée dans la parole: "Père, pardonne-leur, car ils ne savent ce qu'ils font"—reprise et accomplissement de celle que le Verbe avait prononcé à un moment donné de sa vie humaine—, sont manifestés les qualités propres à la perfection de Dieu, à savoir la longanimité, la patience, la miséricorde, la bonté, une philanthropie sans mesure.'[40] For Irenaeus, divine love of enemies provides a single thread which runs through his account of recapitulation and a vision which touches his innumerable images. Confirmation of this conclusion is found in the *Epideixis* where 'the brevity of faith and charity' which fulfils the law is the short word of salvation upon the earth (Ep. 87).

This theme displays the domination of Paul and John in the theology of Irenaeus. 'If in Corinth Paul was resolved to know nothing but Christ and him crucified (1 Cor. 2:2), this was not because he had just come off badly with philosophy in Athens, but because he had nothing else to preach'.[41] For John, Jesus is glorified on the cross where he finishes the work which his father gave him to do and brings his own into the divine unity of love and glory (Jn. 17 et passim).

P.O. Box 20, *Point Lonsdale*, Vic 3225, Australia

---

[40] R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon saint Irénée de Lyon* (Münster, 1978), 119.

[41] C.K. Barrett, *The signs of an apostle* (London, 1970), 93f.

ZUR STRUKTUR VON DIOG 5-6

VON

HORACIO E. LONA

Von den zwei Abschnitten aus *Ad Diognetum*, die hier behandelt werden, ist besonders die Aussage Diog 6,1 bekannt: „Um es einfach zu sagen: was die Seele im Leib ist, so sind die Christen in der Welt." Es geht um einen Vergleich, der in den folgenden Aussagen expliziert wird. Die Sache, die durch das Bild verdeutlicht werden soll, ist die Lage der Christen in der Welt.

Auch wenn Diog 6 in mehrerer Hinsicht eine formale Einheit bildet, gehört es in eine thematische Einheit, die auch Diog 5 einschließt: das Verhältnis der Christen zur Welt.

Zuerst werden die thematischen Gemeinsamkeiten in beiden Kapiteln herausgestellt. Danach soll die eigene Prägung von Diog 6 herausgearbeitet werden. Einige ausgewählten Beispiele werden schließlich die Bedeutung der formalen Struktur für die Auslegung des Textes zeigen.

I. *Die thematische Einheit Diog 5-6*

Aus dem Vergleich der zwei Texteinheiten ergibt sich eine dreifache inhaltliche Gliederung, die beiden Kapiteln gemeinsam ist. Die Wiederaufnahme der Themen erfolgt in Kap. 6 mit unterschiedlicher Ähnlichkeit. Dennoch dürfte sich diese Gliederung als sachgemäß erweisen. Die unterstrichenen Termini weisen auf sprachliche Gemeinsamkeiten hin. Wichtiger ist jedoch der gemeinsame Inhalt.

1. Die Welt als Lebensraum der Christen
   a. Integration

Diog 5	Diog 6
V.1. Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ οὔτε γῇ οὔτε φωνῇ οὔτε ἔθεσι διακεκριμένοι τῶν λοιπῶν εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων.	

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

V.2. Οὔτε γάρ που πόλεις ἰδίας κατοικοῦσιν οὔτε διαλέκτῳ τινὶ παρηλλαγμένῃ χρῶνται οὔτε βίον παράσημον ἀσκοῦσιν.[1]
V.4. Κατοικοῦντες δὲ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας τε καί βαρβάρους ὡς ἕκαστος ἐκληρώθη, καὶ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἔθεσιν ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔν τε ἐσθῆτι καὶ διαίτῃ καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ βίῳ, θαυμαστὴν καὶ ὁμολογουμένως παράδοξον ἐνδείκνυνται τὴν κατάστασιν τῆς ἑαυτῶν πολιτείας.

V.2. Ἔσπαρται κατὰ πάντων τῶν τοῦ σώματος μελῶν ἡ ψυχή, καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ κόσμου πόλεις.

Die Existenz der Christen in der Welt konkretisiert sich weitgehend in gesellschaftlicher Integration (Diog 5). Als Bewohner aller Städte der Welt (Diog 6) zeigen sie, daß der Kosmos der gemeinsame Lebensraum ist, den sie mit allen Menschen—auch mit den Barbaren—teilen. Diese Art der christlichen Präsenz erscheint zuerst unproblematisch.

b. Distanz

V.5. Πατρίδας οἰκοῦσιν ἰδίας, ἀλλ' ὡς πάροικοι· μετέχουσι πάντων ὡς πολῖται, καὶ πανθ' ὑπομένουσιν ὡς ξένοι· πᾶσα ξένη πατρίς ἐστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ πᾶσα πατρὶς ξένη.
Vgl. V.6-9 (ἀλλ' οὐ . . . bzw. ἀλλ' ἐν . . .)

V.3. Οἰκεῖ μὲν ἐν τῷ σώματι ψυχή, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος· καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ εἰσί δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.
V.4. Ἀόρατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν ὁρατῷ φρουρεῖται τῷ σώματι· καὶ χριστιανοὶ γινώσκονται μένοντες ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἀόρατος δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοσέβεια μένει.

Die Präsenz der Christen in der Welt ist durch ein Pradoxon gekennzeichnet. So stark auch die Zugehörigkeit der Christen zur Gesellschaft betont

[1] Auf dem ersten Blick wirkt V.3 stöhrend: „Wahrlich ist ihre Lehre nicht durch irgendwelchen Einfall und durch die Bemühung vielbeschäftiger Menschen von ihnen erfunden, noch vertreten sie eine menschliche Lehre, wie manche (es tun)." W. Eltester meint, Diog 5,3 soll gleich nach 4,6 folgen. Vgl., Das Mysterium des Christentums. Anmerkungen zum Diognetbrief, in: *ZNW* 61 (1970) 278-293, hier 290-293. Gegen die Hypothese einer Umstellung im Text ergeben sich wichtige Einwände. Eine genaue Analyse vermag auch, die Stellung von V.3 im Kontext einsichtig zu machen.

sein mag, jeder Aspekt, in dem sich die „Nähe" zur Welt äußert, enthält zugleich einen anderen, der die entsprechende „Ferne" zur Welt ausdrückt. Diog 5,5 und 6,3 haben grundsätzlichen, allgemeinen Charakter. Auf die johanneische Formel zusammengebracht: Die Christen sind „in der Welt", aber nicht „aus der Welt".[2] Diog 5,6-9 enthält Elemente für eine Konkretisierung, besonders in 5,6-7. In Diog 6,4 äußert sich die Distanz zur Welt in der Unsichtbarkeit der christlichen θεοσέβεια.

2. Der gemeinsame Raum als Ort der Feindseligkeit und Bedrohung

V.11 Ἀγαπῶσι πάντας,
καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων διώκονται.
V.17. Ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὡς ἀλλόφυλοι
πολεμοῦνται, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων
διώκονται,
καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἔχθρας εἰπεῖν οἱ
μισοῦντες οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

V.5. Μισεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ σὰρξ καὶ
πολεμεῖ μηδὲν ἀδικουμένη, δίοτι
ταῖς ἡδοναῖς κωλύεται χρῆσθαι·
μισεῖ καὶ Χριστιανοὺς ὁ κόσμος
μηδὲν ἀδικούμενος, ὅτι ταῖς
ἡδοναῖς ἀντιτάσσονται.
V.6. Ἡ ψυχὴ τὴν μισοῦσαν
ἀγαπᾷ σάρκα καὶ τὰ μέλη·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας
ἀγαπῶσιν.

Bei diesem und dem nächsten Punkt kommt die Struktur am deutlichsten in Diog 6 zum Vorschein. In Diog 5,11-17 verwendet der Vf. nämlich einen „Peristasenkatalog", in dem beide Aspekte verbunden sind: einerseits die Erfahrung des Leidens und der Bedrohung; andererseits ihre Überwindung, die die Erhabenheit der Christen ans Licht bringt. Daher wurden hier nur 5,11.17 herangezogen, weil sie überwiegend das Moment der Negativität beinhalten und sich so besser eignen, den gemeinsamen Raum der Welt als den Ort der Gefährdung für die Christen darzustellen.

3. Die Erhabenheit der Christen in der Welt

V.10. Πείθονται τοῖς ὡρισμένοις
νόμοις, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις βίοις νικῶσι
τοὺς νόμους.
V.12. Ἀγνοοῦνται, καὶ κατακρίνονται·
θανατοῦνται, καὶ ζωοποιοῦνται.
V.14. Ἀτιμοῦνται,
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀτιμίαις δοξάζονται·

V.7. Ἐγκέκλεισται μὲν ἡ ψυχὴ
τῷ σώματι, συνέχει δὲ αὐτὴ τὸ
σῶμα·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται
μὲν ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ,
αὐτοὶ δὲ συνέχουσι τὸν κόσμον.
V.8. Ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ

[2] Das κόσμος-Verständnis in *Ad Diognetum* ist nicht identisch mit dem der johanneischen Schriften.

βλασφημοῦνται, καὶ δικαιοῦνται.
V.15. Λοιδοροῦνται καὶ εὐλογοῦσιν· ὑβρίζονται, καὶ τιμῶσιν.
V.16. Ἀγαθοποιοῦντες ὡς κακοὶ κολάζονται· κολαζόμενοι χαίρουσιν ὡς ζωοποιούμενοι.

σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παροικοῦσιν ἐν φθαρτοῖς, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι.
V.9. Κακουργουμένη σιτίοις καὶ ποτοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ βελτιοῦται·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κολαζόμενοι καθ' ἡμέραν πλεονάζουσι μᾶλλον.

Die Texte, die in Diog 5 dem „Peristasenkatalog" zugehören (V.12.14-16), zeigen formale Varianten. Es überwiegt die Kontrastform, in kurzen Sätzen, die zuerst die Gefährdung benennt, um anschließend ihre Überwindung anzukündigen. V.12 ist anders gestaltet, indem erst auf die dreigliedrige Steigerung: „unbekannt – verurteilt – umgebracht" das die Not wendende Positive folgt: Sie werden lebendig gemacht. V.10 ist mit V.11-15 durch ein stilistisches Merkmal verbunden. Es handelt sich um eine Reihe von Gegenüberstellungen, die ein adversatives καί verbindet. Inhaltlich läßt sich V.10 jedoch kaum dem „Peristasenkatalog" zurechnen.

Diog 6,7-9 zeigt die Überlegenheit der Christen in der Welt durch drei thematische Aussagen: Sie sind in der Welt wie in einem Gefängnis, aber sie halten die Welt zusammen (V.7); sie wohnen im Vergänglichen, aber sie erwarten die Unvergänglichkeit in den Himmeln (V.8); obwohl sie bestraft werden, nehmen sie jeden Tag zu (V.9). Auch hier liegt eine Kontraststruktur vor—die Erhabenheit der Christen in der Welt artikuliert sich auf einem negativen Hintergrund—, aber sie ist anders geartet als in Kap. 5. Die zwei ersten Aussagen haben mit der weltlichen Existenz im allgemeinen zu tun. Nur V.9 läßt konkrete Gefährdung erblicken.

Es liegt auf der Hand, daß die Ausdrucksweise in Kap. 5 und Kap. 6 jeweils recht unterschiedlich ist, wiewohl die thematische Entsprechung deutlich erkennbar sein dürfte. Bei einem Autor, der über die sprachliche Kompetenz verfügt, die dem Vf. von *Ad Diognetum* zugesprochen werden muß, ist der Sachverhalt nicht überraschend. Die Einzelanalyse könnte auch aufweisen, wie er jede formale Einheit durch ständige Variationen vor stilistischer Monotonie bewahrt.

II. *Die eigene Prägung von Diog 6*

Der Abschnitt ist deutlich und streng strukturiert. Die Lage der Christen in der Welt wird anhand eines Vergleichs dargestellt. Der Vergleichspunkt ist das Verhältnis der Seele zum Leib. V.1 gibt das Thema an. V.2-9 enthalten

jeweils zuerst eine kurze Aussage über die Seele im menschlichen Leib, der immer eine zweite Aussage folgt, die das Bild auf die Christen in der Welt überträgt: „So auch die Christen . . ." (καὶ Χριστιανοί . . .). V.10 schließt das Thema ab: Das Gesagte entspricht einer von Gott bestimmten Ordnung.

Wie die folgende Übersicht zeigt, bemüht sich der Vf., die Distanz zwischen Bild und Sache so weit wie möglich zu verkleinern, und so verwendet er meistens bei deren Ausdruck die gleichen Begriffe. In V.2.3.5.6.7 ist dies ganz augenfällig. Beachtet man die Zahl der unterstrichenen Wendungen, die auf eine solche Entsprechung hinweisen,[3] läßt sich darin die Absicht des Vf.s erkennen, einfach und prägnant zu formulieren.

Die Ausdrucksweise erlaubt ihm, eine Vielfalt von Themen thetisch anzusprechen (s.u.), ohne auf Begründungen oder Erklärungen zurückgreifen zu müssen. Die Anschaulichkeit des Bildes und die unproblematische Übertragung auf die gemeinte Sache machen weitere Worte überflüssig, was allerdings nicht bedeutet, daß der Sinn jeder Aussage so klar und eindeutig ist, wie man der einfachen Struktur nach erwarten würde.

– Die Elemente des Vergleichs: Wie die Seele im Leib, so die Christen in der Welt.

V.1. Ἁπλῶς δ' εἰπεῖν· ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν σώματι ψυχή,
τοῦτ' εἰσὶν ἐν κόσμῳ Χριστιανοί.

– Die Ausbreitung der Christen in der Welt.

V.2. Ἔσπαρται κατὰ πάντων τῶν τοῦ σώματος μελῶν ἡ ψυχή·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ κόσμου πόλεις.

– Die Christen in der Welt, aber nicht aus der Welt.

V.3. Οἰκεῖ μὲν ἐν τῷ σώματι ψυχή,
οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν,
οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

– Die unsichtbare Religion der Christen.

V.4. Ἀόρατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν ὁρατῷ φρουρεῖται τῷ σώματι·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ γινώσκονται μένοντες[4] ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,
ἀόρατος δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοσέβεια μένει.

---

[3] V.9 macht eine gewisse Ausnahme, indem die Entsprechung auf einer semantischen Ebene liegt, nicht in der Ausdrucksweise.

[4] Die LA von A und H γινώσκονται μένοντες ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ wurde von Stephanus zu γινώσκονται μὲν ὄντες ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ korrigiert. Bis zur zweiten Auflage der Textausgabe von Hefele (1842) wurde die LA von A und H übernommen. Vgl. I. C. Th. Otto,

– Der Haß der Welt gegen die Christen.

V.5. Μισεῖ *τὴν ψυχὴν* ἡ σὰρξ καὶ πολεμεῖ
μηδὲν ἀδικουμένη,
διότι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς κωλύεται χρῆσθαι·
μισεῖ καὶ *Χριστιανοὺς* ὁ κόσμος
μηδὲν ἀδικούμενος,
ὅτι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ἀντιτάσσονται.

– Die Liebe der Christen gegenüber ihren Hassern.

V.6. *Ἡ ψυχὴ* τὴν μισοῦσαν ἀγαπᾷ σάρκα καὶ τὰ μέλη·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ἀγαπῶσιν.

– Die Christen halten die Welt zusammen.

V.7. Ἐγκέκλεισται μὲν ἡ *ψυχὴ* τῷ σώματι,
συνέχει δὲ αὐτὴ τὸ σῶμα·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μὲν ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ,
αὐτοὶ δὲ συνέχουσι τὸν κόσμον.

– Die vergängliche Welt als Ort der Hoffnung auf Unvergänglichkeit.

V.8. Ἀθάνατος ἡ *ψυχὴ* ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παροικοῦσιν ἐν φθαρτοῖς,
τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι.

– Die positive Auswirkung der Bestrafungen.

V.9. Κακουργουμένη σιτίοις καὶ ποτοῖς ἡ *ψυχὴ* βελτιοῦται·
καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κολαζόμενοι καθ' ἡμέραν πλεονάζουσι μᾶλλον.

– Die Lage der Christen in der Welt als Ausdruck der Ordnung Gottes.

V.10. Εἰς τοιαύτην αὐτοὺς τάξιν ἔθετο ὁ θεός, ἣν οὐ θεμιτὸν αὐτοῖς παραιτήσασθαι.

Corpus apologetarum christianorum saeculi secundi, III. *Iustini philosophi et martyris opera quae feruntur omnia*. II. *Opera Justini addubitata*. Jena ^{1}1843; ^{2}1852; ^{3}1879, 181 Anm. 4. Nach 1842 hat sich die Konjektur von Stephanus in allen Textausgaben behauptet. Das *μὲν* ὄντες paßt zwar zu folgendem ἀόρατος *δὲ* αὐτῶν, aber das ist kein zwingender Grund, um den Text zu ändern. V3. zeigt, daß der Vf. frei mit den Partikeln umgeht. V.3a gestaltet nämlich die inhaltliche Gegenüberstellung mit μέν und δέ, aber in V.3b wird nur ein δέ verwendet. Es handelt sich um eine stilistische Freiheit, die keineswegs ungewöhnlich ist. Wenn man die LA von A und H übernimmt, dann gewinnt der Text eine formale Gestalt, die zum Stil des ganzen Abschnitts gut paßt, ohne am Inhalt etwas zu ändern. Die Aussage über die Christen (V.4.b.c) stellt den Kontrast von „sichtbar" und „unsichtbar" anhand des Verbs „bleiben" als Verbindungswort dar.

Die Aussagen über die Seele in V.2-9 lassen sich in drei Gruppen einordnen:

1. V.2-4: die Seele im „Raum" des Leibes;

2. V.5-6: der gemeinsame Raum als Ort eines Spannungsverhältnisses von Liebe und Haß;

3. V.7-9: die Überlegenheit der Seele über den Leib: V.7: sie hält den Leib zusammen; V.8: sie ist unsterblich, der Leib aber vergänglich; V.9: die Entbehrungen machen sie besser.

Der durchgeführte Vergleich mit Kap. 5 hat gezeigt, daß Kap. 6 in deutlicher und prägnanter Form die Themen zusammenfaßt, die im Kapitel zuvor enthalten sind. Die Bezogenheit der Bildhälfte (die Seele im Leib) auf die Sachhälfte (die Christen in der Welt) erklärt, warum diese thematische Struktur sich in den Aussagen über die Seele widerspiegelt.

In diesem Schema sind kleine Abweichungen zu finden—keineswegs unbedeutsame—, die aber die formale Einheit des Textes nicht beeinträchtigen. So ist in V.5-6 der Terminus für das Bild der Welt nicht der Leib, sondern das Fleisch. Dazu gibt es eine Eigentümlichkeit im Satzbau. Nicht die Seele bzw. die Christen sind das Subjekt der parallel gebauten Doppelaussage (s.o.)—wie sonst in V.1-4.6-9—, sondern ihre jeweiligen Kontrahenten: das Fleisch und die Welt. Die gewählte Form hat eine sachliche Begründung. Die Seele bzw. die Christen sind das Objekt eines ungerechten Hasses: Sie haben den Agenten des Hasses keinen Schaden zugefügt; ihre Rolle ist passiv: sie ertragen den Haß. Bei der Bildaussage kommt dies noch deutlicher zum Ausdruck. Das Fleisch nämlich haßt und bekämpft die Seele. Sodann wird die Doppelaussage mit einem διότι- bzw. ὅτι-Satz abgeschlossen, der den Vorgang erklärt. In ihnen übernimmt die Seele bzw. die Christen eine aktive Rolle: die Seele verhindert, daß der Leib sich den Lüsten hingibt; die Christen treten den Lüsten entgegen. Der Subjektwechsel—nicht mehr das Fleisch bzw. die Welt, sondern die Seele bzw. die Christen—trägt davon Rechnung.

Bei den drei Aussagen über die Überlegenheit der Seele über dem Leib bzw. der Christen über der Welt (V.7-9) kommen σῶμα und κόσμος nur in V.7 vor. In V.8 wird der Leib metaphorisch als „sterbliche Behausung" (ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι) bezeichnet. Das Wohnen in der Welt der Christen ist ein Wohnen „im Vergänglichen" (ἐν φθαρτοῖς). V.9 erwähnt den Leib bzw. die Welt nicht einmal metaphorisch. Zwei passivische Partizipien (über die Seele: κακουργουμένη; über die Christen: κολαζόμενοι) weisen unscharf auf den Leib—in Verbindung mit ihm wird die Seele „schlecht behandelt"—, und auf die Welt hin, wo die Christen „bestraft werden." Die Überlegen-

heit der Seele über den Leib und der Christen über die Welt erreicht somit einen sinnfälligen Ausdruck. Der andere Terminus der Relation, dem die Überlegenheit gilt, wird zum Schluß nicht mehr genannt.

III. *Struktur und Auslegung in Diog 6*

Die semantische Struktur in Diog 6 ist einfach, aber in der Auslegung des Textes wird sie nicht konsequent genug zur Grundlage für die Interpretation gemacht. Einige Beispiele dazu aus der alten und neuen Forschungsgeschichte. Zu V.6 bemerkt J. Geffcken: „Gleichwohl darf nicht verkannt werden, daß der Briefsteller denn doch seinem sophistischen Triebe, der von ihm gezogenen Parallele weiteste Ausdehnung zu verleihen, über das Maß hinaus nachgegeben hat. Denn von der Liebe gerade der christlichen Seele zu Fleisch und Gliedern dürfte doch kaum die Rede sein".[5] In der Bildhälfte geht es aber nicht um die „christliche" Seele, sondern um eine Aussage über die Seele im allgemeinen.

Ebensowenig sind die Überlegungen von R. Brändle hilfreich: „Dass das Fleisch die Seele hasst, zeigt, dass damit die widergöttliche Macht gemeint ist. Allerdings lässt der Zusatz 'und die Glieder' vermuten, dass der Vf. mit σάρξ zugleich auch den Körper meint. Zudem kann ja nur vom Körper ausgesagt werden, dass die Seele des Christen ihn liebt. Bei diesem Verständnis rückt Eph 5,28 als nahe Parallele ins Blickfeld".[6] Auch hier wird der bildliche Charakter der Aussage nicht beachtet. Nimmt und interpretiert man die Bildaussage als Sachaussage, gerät die Auslegung in eine Sackgasse bei Geffcken—oder sie neigt zu einem assoziativen Verfahren—bei Brändle—, das sachfremde Elemente heranzieht und verbindet.

Im Hintergrund steht freilich eine Frage, die nicht übersehen werden darf. Wie weit spiegelt sich in den Aussagen über die Seele, die die Christen repräsentiert, ein bestimmtes Menschenbild wider? Für eine Antwort darauf erweist sich Diog 6,8 als besonders geeignet.

Die Bildhälfte (V.8a) ist durch die Gegenüberstellung „sterblich-unsterblich" geprägt. Die Diktion entspricht der platonischen Ausdrucksweise über die ψυχή, etwa in Phaidon 80a-b. Die Seele gehört zum Göttlichen und Unsterblichen, der Leib zum Sterblichen (ἡ μὲν ψυχὴ τῷ θείῳ . . . καὶ ἀθανάτῳ,

---

[5] Vgl. J. Geffcken, *Der Brief an Diognetos*, Heidelberg 1928.

[6] Vgl. R. Brändle, *Die Ethik der „Schrift an Diognet". Eine Wiederaufnahme paulinischer und johanneischer Theologie am Ausgang des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (AThANT 64), Zürich 1975, 151.

τὸ δὲ σῶμα τῷ θνητῷ).[7] Das vorangestellte ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχή gibt das Thema an. Der Unterschied zu V.3: οἰκεῖ μὲν ἐν τῷ σώματι ψυχή, liegt auf der Hand. Der unsterblichen Seele steht ihre sterbliche Behausung gegenüber (ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι), wie es metaphorisch für den Leib heißt.[8]

Die Sachhälfte (V.8b) konnte nur annähernd dem skizzierten Bild entsprechen. Denn die Christen sind nicht unsterblich, und sie erwarten auch nicht die Unsterblichkeit. Die ἀθανασία wäre im strengen Sinn nur auf die Seele bezogen, und dies ist nicht der Gegenstand der christlichen Hoffnung. Anders verhält es sich mit der Erwartung der ἀφθαρσία, die verbunden mit der Überwindung der Vergänglichkeit auf den Leib bezogen ist.[9] Wahrscheinlich liegt hier der Grund, weswegen der Vf. von „sterblicher Behausung" und nicht von „Leib" in V.8a spricht. Das der Bildhälfte zugrundeliegende Menschenbild ist dualistisch platonisch inspiriert, und der explizite Hinweis auf den „sterblichen Leib" hätte eine notwendige Korrektur bzw. Klarstellung in der Sachhälfte verlangt. Das Spezifische der christlichen Hoffnung ist eben nicht der Glaube an die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, sondern an die Unvergänglichkeit des Leibes durch die Auferstehung.

Die Diktion in der Sachaussage ist dementsprechend wohl überlegt. Das

---

[7] Nach H. G. Meecham (*The Epistle to Diognetus. The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes*, Manchester 1949, 116) „the meaning is not that the soul is necessarily immortal ... But the soul is capable of immortality by union with the divine Spirit." Der Vf. lehnt sich vorbehaltlos an platonische Begrifflichkeit an. Der Geist spielt im ganzen Text ohnehin keine Rolle. Dadurch, daß er in der Sachaussage (V.8b) die Bildelemente (V.8a) semantisch umbiegt, war es ihm möglich, eine solche Aussage über die Seele zu machen, ohne sich mit ihrem Inhalt vielleicht unbedingt zu identifizieren. R. Brändle, *Ethik* (s. Anm. 6) 154f, versteht wie Meecham V.8a als Sachaussage über die Christen. Durch die Verbindung mit Diog 9,2 und 10,7 kommt er zum Ergebnis, daß der Vf. die Unsterblichkeit der Seele als Gabe Gottes versteht, „die den Glaubenden zuteil wird. Er wird also auch in 6,8 an die Seele des Glaubenden denken."

[8] Zu σκήνωμα vgl. W. Michaelis, ThWNT VII 385f. Vgl. Sextus Sententiae 320: τὸ σκήνωμα τῆς ψυχῆς σου βαρύνεσθαι μὲν ὑπερήφανον, ἀποθέσθαι δὲ πραέως ὁπότε χρὴ δύνασθαι μακάριον. Rufinus übersetzt: „Tabernaculum corporis graviter quidem ferre superbum est, deponere autem posse cum oportuerit in pace beatum est." Der Sinn des Spruches ist: Wenn die Behausung des Seele schwerfällig wird (als Hinweis auf den kommenden Tod), ist herrlich; ihn (d.h. den Leib) sanft abzulegen, wenn es sein muß, ist selig. Vgl. 2 Petr 1,14: εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου. Das „Ablegen der Behausung" meint den Tod.

[9] Ein Text wie 1 Kor 15,53f: δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσηται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσηται ἀθανασίαν, τότε . . ., zeigt, daß ἀφθαρσία und ἀθανασία auch als komplementäre Begriffe verstanden und verwendet wurden. Der Vf. scheint in V.8 genauer mit der Begrifflichkeit umzugehen.

Verb παροικοῦσιν, das die Existenz der Christen im Bereich des Vergänglichen ausdrückt, nimmt 5,5a wieder auf: πατρίδας οἰκοῦσιν ἰδίας, ἀλλ' ὡς πάροικοι, d.h. die Christen leben auch im eigenen Vaterland wie Beisassen. Die gleiche elementare Fremdheit betrifft nun das Leben der Christen ἐν φθαρτοῖς.[10] Die Herkunft dieser Fremdheit ist nicht schwer zu erraten. Nach Diog 5,9 weilen die Christen zwar auf Erden (ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν), ihre eigentliche Heimat aber ist der Himmel (ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται). So versteht sich, daß sie nur als Beisassen im Vergänglichen weilen, während sie auf die Unvergänglichkeit in den Himmeln warten (τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι).[11]

Hinter der Formulierung dürfte nichts anderes als die Auferstehungshoffnung zu verstehen sein, aber das Thema wird verständlicherweise nicht expliziert. Zum formalen Rahmen des Kap. 6 hätte eine das Bild sprengende Ausdeutung nicht gepaßt. Auch inhaltlich stünde das Bekenntnis zur Auferstehung des Leibes in V.8b semantisch recht asymmetrisch zur Aussage in V.8a. Die Erwartung der Unvergänglichkeit in den Himmeln hingegen überschreitet als Ausdruck nicht die vorgegebene formale Grenze und bleibt inhaltlich mehrdeutig—darunter konnte auch die Auferstehung des Leibes verstanden werden—und war somit auch für hellenistisches Denken annehmbar.

Kehren wir zur gestellten Frage zurück. Ist der Autor von *Ad Diognetum* ein christlicher Platoniker, der zwar platonisch spricht—die Seele ist an sich unsterblich—, jedoch christlich denkt—die Unsterblichkeit ist Gabe Gottes—, wie Meecham und Brändle glauben?[12] Die Frage müßte bejaht werden, würde man die Bildaussage als semantisch gleichwertig mit der Sachaussage verstehen. Das ist aber von der Struktur des Vergleichs allgemein und vom Thema in Diog 5-6 her nicht zutreffend. Denn bei jedem Vergleich geht es primär um die Sache, die durch das Bild ausgedrückt werden soll. Das Bild bleibt semantisch mehrdeutig und ihre Übertragung wird „sachgemäß", wenn das „tertium comparationis"—der semantische

[10] Die Begriffe φθαρτός und ἀφθαρσία sind nicht platonisch, sondern erst bei Aristoteles belegt. Sie sind hingegen Hauptbegriffe der jüdisch-hellenistischen und der christlichen Eschatologie.

[11] Wie weit sich hinter dem Ausdruck der Erwartung (προσδεχόμενοι) eine konkrete Haltung des Hoffens verbirgt, ist schwer zu sagen. προσδέχεσθαι kommt in *Ad Diognetum* nur hier vor. Die Ausdrucksweise erweckt eher den Eindruck, die Erwartung der Unvergänglichkeit gehört zu einem Grundwissen über die Christen in der Welt, die zu ihrer besondere Befindlichkeit und Erhabenheit gehört.

[12] S.o. Anm. 7.

Aspekt, der die Sache charakterisieren soll—richtig getroffen wurde. Auch vom Thema her besteht kein Zweifel, daß in Diog 6 keinerlei Interesse an einer Anthropologie besteht.[13] Die merkwürdige Lage der Christen in der Welt steht im Vordergrund, nichts anderes.

Das Bild von der Seele im Leib hat gewiß eigene Konturen.[14] Wenn der Vf. es aufgreift, dann weil er weiß, daß dieses Bild bei seinen Adressaten auf Zustimmung stoßen wird. Von den kulturellen Vorgaben her ist die Identifizierung mit der Seele eine Selbstverständlichkeit. Da nun durch die Seele im Leib die Christen in der Welt dargestellt werden, ist ihre Identifizierung mit den Christen ein weiterer Schritt, der von einer gewissen „rhetorischen Logik" nahegelegt wird.

Zwischen Bild- und Sachaussage besteht eine eigentümliche Wechselwirkung. So ist die Aussage, daß die Welt die Christen haßt, weil sie sich den Lüsten entgegenstellen (V.5b), vom Bild der Seele im Kampf gegen die Lust beeinflußt (V.5a). Dadurch können die Christen als voll integrierte Mitglieder in der Gesellschaft der Philosophen erscheinen, die die ἡδονή für „den stärksten Köder des Bösen" halten (Plato, Tim. 69d). V.6 scheint hingegen anders konzipiert zu sein. Hier ist das Bild von der Fleisch und Glieder liebenden Seele vom christlichen Motiv der Feindesliebe her entworfen.

In V.8a geht der Vf. am weitesten in der Aufnahme einer zentralen platonischen Anschauung über die Seele. V.8b macht aber deutlich, daß er in der Sache der christlichen Hoffnung nicht platonisch denkt. Um die platonische Prägung der Aussage zu mildern bzw. um ein christliches Element einfließen zu lassen, kümmert er sich jedoch nicht. Die Zweideutigkeit wird einfach hingenommen, wie so oft in anderen „Analogien" des christlichen

---

[13] Anders R. Brändle, *Ethik* (s. Anm. 6) 155: „Der Autor macht nicht Aussagen zu einer allgemein von der Offenbarung unabhängigen Anthropologie. Er denkt an die der Offenbarung geöffnete, vom Logos erleuchtete Seele." Andererseits will er die Vergleichsstruktur aufrechterhalten: „Sein Interesse liegt allerdings ganz beim Vergleich zwischen der Seele und den Christen. Ausgangspunkt sind die auf die Seele bezogenen Aussagen der jeweils ersten Hälfte der Verse, Zielpunkt aber, auf dem der Akzent liegt, sind die Aussagen über die Christen."

[14] Der traditionelle Hintergrund hat m.E. R. Joly richtig herausgestellt: 1. in Diog 6 geht es nicht um die Weltseele, sondern um die menschliche Seele 2. das Verhältnis der Seele zum Leib ist das Bild für die Stellung des Philosophen zum Rest der Menschheit bzw. der Regierenden zum Volk. Vgl. ders., *Christianisme et philosophie. Etudes sur Justin et les Apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle*, Bruxelles 1973, 210-216. Seine Kritik an der Deutung von H. I. Marrou (*A Diognète. Introduction, édition critique, traduction et commentaire* [SC 33bis], Paris [1]1951, [2]1965, 137-176) ist grundsätzlich richtig.

Glaubens mit der hellenistischen Kultur und Religion.[15] Die Bildebene, auf der die Aussage über die unsterbliche Seele steht, erlaubt dem Vf., sich ganz platonisch auszudrücken, ohne deswegen eine durch den Charakter der christlichen Eschatologie notwendige Korrektur einbringen zu müssen. Er spricht die Sprache seiner gebildeten Adressaten. Dadurch, daß er die platonisch anmutende Aussage (V.8a) und den Ausdruck der christlichen Hoffnung (V.8b) in ein unproblematisches Verhältnis von Bild und Sache setzt, erweckt er den Eindruck einer glatten Entsprechung, die annehmbar weil sinnvoll ist. Rhetorik bedeutet hier nicht nur kunstvolle Diktion, sondern das, was sie ursprünglich ist: echte Überredungskunst.

Auch wenn die dargelegte Struktur in der Auslegung von Diog 6 noch sorgfältig beachtet wird, sind die Schwierigkeiten bei der Deutung des Textes damit längst nicht beseitigt. Das kann keine formale Annährung an den Text leisten. Sie kann aber leisten, daß die Probleme deutlicher gesehen werden.

Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule
D-83671 *Benediktbeuern*, Don-Bosco-Strasse 1

[15] Vgl. Justin, I *Ap.* 21-23.

BASILIDES AS AN ARISTOTELIANIZING GNOSTIC

BY

ABRAHAM P. BOS

Introduction

My aim in this contribution is to argue that the information which Hippolytus provides about Aristotle has not been taken seriously enough.[1] Study of Hippolytus' text on Basilides can 'benefit' our knowledge of Aristotle's philosophy. But a corrected knowledge of Aristotle's philosophy can, in turn, 'benefit'[2] our assessment of the system which Hippolytus attributes to Basilides and his son Isidorus.

The single point of difference between Aristotle and his teacher

In his *Refutatio* I 20, 3-4 Hippolytus makes a surprising statement about Aristotle's psychology. He says:

> In most points he [sc. Aristotle] is in agreement with Plato, except the opinion concerning soul. For Plato affirms it to be immortal, but Aristotle that it continues to exist; and [after these things] that it also vanishes in the fifth body, which he supposes, along with the other four [elements],—viz. fire, and earth, and water, and air,—to be something more subtle [than these], of the nature of spirit.

---

[1] O. Gigon, *Aristotelis Opera* vol. III 'Deperditorum librorum fragmenta' (Berlin 1987) included not a single text from Hippolytus. On the value of Hippolytus' information about Aristotle, cf. A.J. Festugière, *L'idéal religieux des Grecs et l'évangile* (Paris 1932) 233-251; C. Osborne, *Rethinking early Greek philosophy. Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* (Ithaca 1987); M.J. Edwards, 'Hippolytus of Rome on Aristotle', *Eranos* 88 (1990) 25-29; J. Mansfeld, *Heresiography in context. Hippolytus' Elenchos as a source for Greek philosophy* (Leiden 1992); I. Mueller, 'Heterodoxy and doxography in Hippolytus' *Refutation of all heresies'*, *ANRW* II 36, 6 (Berlin 1992) 4309-4374; id. 'Hippolytus, Aristotle, Basilides', in L.P. Schrenk (ed.) *Aristotle in late Antiquity* (Washington D.C. 1994) 143-157.

[2] For the motif of εὑεργετεῖν καὶ εὑεργετεῖσθαι cf. Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 10-11; 25, 1; 26, 10; 27, 11; 27, 12; X 14, 5; 14, 6; 14, 9. For Hippolytus' text, see P. Wendland, *Hippolytus, Werke* vol. 3 (GCS 26) (Leipzig 1916; repr. Hildesheim 1977) and M. Marcovich, *Hippolytus, Refutatio omnium haeresium* (Berlin/New York 1986).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

> 20.6 This philosopher also affirms . . . that the soul of the entire world is immortal, and the world itself is eternal, but that [the soul] in an individual, as we have before stated, vanishes [in the fifth body]. (transl. J.H. Macmahon with changes)[3]

Hippolytus' statement is remarkable. Judging only by the words used in I 20, 4, we must conclude that Hippolytus attributes to Aristotle the view that the soul consists of a physical body, if a very special, fine body. This would mean that Hippolytus ascribes to Aristotle a materialistic or at least hylozoistic psychology. Such a psychology is not to be found anywhere in Aristotle's extant work. Attempts to connect it with his lost works have been made[4] but also vehemently disputed.

Yet it is doubtful whether the totality of information about Aristotle's psychology which Hippolytus provides in his critical discussion of Basilides' heretical doctrine[5] should force us to dismiss this information. Hippolytus tells us here what Aristotle said about the soul, but not what happens to the intellect. In his surviving treatises Aristotle repeatedly affirms that if there is anything immortal in man, it is his intellect.[6] For Aristotle this has

---

[3] Hipp. *Haer.* I 20, 3-4; 6 (ed. M. Marcovich): καὶ σχεδὸν τὰ πλεῖστα τῷ Πλάτωνι σύμφωνός ἐστιν πλὴν τοῦ περὶ ψυχῆς δόγματος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πλάτων ἀθάνατον, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐπιδιαμένειν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ταύτην ἐναφανίζεσθαι τῷ πέμπτῳ σώματι, ὃ ὑποτίθεται εἶναι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τεσσάρων . . . λεπτότερον, οἷον πνεῦμα. . . . 6: τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὲν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου ἀθάνατον εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν κόσμον ἀίδιον, τὴν δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, ὡς προείπομεν, ἀφανίζεσθαι.

[4] Cf. P. Merlan, in A.H. Armstrong (ed.), *C.H.E.G.L.M.Ph.* (Cambridge 1967) 40-41 with n. 9. See also J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne (Ambroise,* Exam. I 1, 1-4*)* (Paris 1964) 226-234; 475-492.

[5] On Basilides, see H. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen 1907) 91ff.; H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (Leipzig ²1934) 196-256; G. Quispel, "L'homme gnostique (La doctrine de Basilide)", *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 16 (1948) 89-139, repr. in id. *Gnostic Studies* vol. I (Istanbul 1974) 103-134; J.H. Waszink, 'Basilides', *RACh* 1 (1950) 1217-1225; W. Foerster, 'Das System des Basilides', *NTS* 9 (1962/63) 233-255; R.M. Grant, 'Place de Basilide dans la théologie chrétienne ancienne', *REA* 25 (1979) 201-216; *The Gnostic Scriptures,* a new transl. by B. Layton (New York 1987) 417-444; W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule. Eine Studie zur Theologie- und Kirchengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen 1996). My contribution partly aims at modifying the results of W.A. Löhr's discussion of Hippolytus' exposition on Basilides.

[6] Arist. *Anim.* II 2, 413b24-29. Perhaps he also argued this in his lost work the *Eudemus.* This is the thrust of Themist., *In De an.* 106, 29-107, 5 = Arist. *Eudem.* fr. 2 Ross; 58 Gigon. However, assuming a development in Aristotle's thought, one might suspect that Themistius is harmonizing here between the view of the early Aristotle and a different, later position, as is suggested by J.M. Rist, *The mind of Aristotle. A study of philosophical growth* (Toronto 1989) 166.

to do with the fact that the intellect as intellect has no relationship with any bodily activity.[7] By contrast, the soul is said to realize its typically psychic activities, such as sense-perception and emotions, 'not without body'.[8]

Now, what does Hippolytus mean in I 20, 3-4? Does he think that, in Aristotle's view, everything in man over and above his visible body survives for a while after the individual's death, but then dissolves[9] into the fifth element? Or does he attribute a different view to Aristotle, namely that everything in man over and above his visible body survives for a while after the individual's death, ascending to the heavenly regions, and that then the soul (or the soul-body) dissolves in the heavenly ethereal sphere, while the intellect leaves behind the soul-body and is united with the divine Intellect? In any case this view was held in Antiquity[10] and was also connected with the name of Aristotle.[11]

Precisely the link which Hippolytus makes between Aristotle and Basilides suggests that Hippolytus has such a position in mind. Basilides has a very special theory about a 'threefold Sonship'.[12] By this he means the divine substances present in the World-seed from which the cosmos develops. This Sonship is 'of the same essence'[13] as the transcendent God[14] who thought out the entire cosmic process. The highest part of that Sonship, immediately after the deposition of the World-seed, easily ascends to its origin, God. But the Sonship of the second category is unable to do this by itself. It therefore clothes itself in 'holy *Pneuma*' and thus is able to ascend.[15] But because the Sonship is 'of the same essence' as the transcendent God and

---

[7] Cf. Arist. *Gener. anim.* II 3, 736b28-29.

[8] Arist. *Anim.* I 1, 403a3-18. Both in 403a6 and a9 we should read ἄνευ σώματος.

[9] This was later the position of the Stoa. Cf. *SVF* II 774; 822 and R. Hoven, *Stoïcisme et stoïciens face au problème de l'au-delà* (Paris 1971) 44-65.

[10] See Plut. *Facie* 942F ff.

[11] See Procl. *In Ti.* III 238, 19 (ed. E. Diehl); Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom.* 2, 128 in combination with 2, 122-123.

[12] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 7ff.

[13] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 7; 22, 12-13; X 14, 2.

[14] Hippolytus also attributes to Aristotle a transcendent Intellect as the supreme God, whose activity he describes in the formula from Arist. *Metaph.* Λ 9, 1074b34 as 'thinking of thinking' (νόησις γὰρ, φησίν, ἐστὶ νοήσεως). Cf. *Haer.* VII 19, 7. He identifies this God with the highest God in Basilides' system in VII 21, 1. In connection with the notion of νόησις W.A. Löhr, *op. cit.* 182-183, rightly points to philosophical intellectualism in Basilides, but wrongly links this to Plato's theory of science.

[15] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 9-11.

holy *Pneuma* is not, that holy *Pneuma* must be left behind in the end.[16] As a physical body, holy *Pneuma* is part of cosmic reality and subsequently forms the firmament or boundary of the cosmos. But the Sonship ascends to the hypercosmic sphere and to the transcendent God.

This is a very remarkable part of Basilides' theo-cosmology, and we should therefore consider that Hippolytus' statement about Aristotle's doctrine of soul means: the soul dissolves into the heavenly celestial sphere just as Basilides' *Pneuma* dissolves into the cosmic firmament. This leaves the intellect entirely free of corporeality, just as the Sonship in Basilides manifests its true divine nature in the hypercosmic sphere and is united with God.

However, assuming that this is Hippolytus' view of Aristotle's psychology, why should we believe that he is right? Surely anybody who hears such a view being ascribed to Aristotle will shrug his shoulders and see it as typical evidence of general confusion and Hippolytus' confusion in particular?[17]

Nevertheless, I want to argue that those who accuse Hippolytus of confusion do so because *their* modern standard interpretation of Aristotle's psychological theory is confused.[18] I will explain this before continuing with Hippolytus.

Aristotle's theory of a special soul-body

A famous (and notorious) text in Aristotle's *De generatione animalium* occurs in II 3, where he says: 'The *dynamis* of every soul seems to have something of another and more divine body than the so-called elements'.[19] This

---

[16] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 12-13.

[17] See e.g. the judgement of I. Mueller, which I quote in the Conclusion.

[18] I have developed this claim in A.P. Bos, "Aristotle's psychology: diagnosis of the need for a fundamental reinterpretation", *Am. Cathol. Philos. Quart.* 73 (1999) 309-331; "Aristotle's *De anima* II 1: the traditional interpretation rejected", in D. Sfendoni-Mentzou; J. Hattiangadi; D. Johnson (eds), *Aristotle and contemporary science* (New York: P. Lang, 1999) vol. 2; 'Why the soul needs an instrumental body according to Aristotle (*Anim.* I 3, 407b13-26)', *Hermes* 127 (1999); "Aristotle's doctrine of the instrumental body of the soul", *Philosophia Reformata* 64 (1999) 37-51; "'Het gehele lichaam dat waarnemingsvermogen bezit' (Arist. *Anim.* II 1, 412b24-25)', *Alg. Ned. Tijdschr. v. Wijsb.* 91 (1999) 112-128; *De ziel en haar voertuig. Aristoteles' psychologie geherinterpreteerd en de eenheid van zijn oeuvre gedemonstreerd* (Leende: Damon Press, 1999). This alternative view was first suggested in G. Reale, A.P. Bos, *Il trattato Sul cosmo per Alessandro attribuito ad Aristotele* (Milano 1995) 288.

[19] Arist. *Gener. anim.* II 3, 736b29-31: πάσης μὲν οὖν ψυχῆς δύναμις ἑτέρου σώματος ἔοικε κεκοινωνηκέναι καὶ θειοτέρου τῶν καλουμένων στοιχείων.

text, of which no one disputes the Aristotelian authorship, claims that it is essential to every soul (of plant, animal, or human being) that it has a structural connection with the heavenly astral or ethereal element. This connection is manifested in what is called *pneuma* or vital heat in human beings and (higher) animals.[20] Aristotle also uses the term 'natural fire'[21] or even 'psychic fire'[22] to designate this life-generating, vital principle. The soul uses this body as its instrument,[23] and the qualities 'hot' and 'cold' of this body are also called instruments of the soul.[24]

Now, in *De anima* Aristotle declares that the soul 'is not a body but something of a body'.[25] This work also contains his famous definition of the soul: 'the soul is the first *entelecheia* of a natural body which has potential for life and is *organikon*'.[26] But this definition has always been wrongly explained! Since Alexander of Aphrodisias, 'natural body' has always been interpreted as the visible body of living creatures, and '*organikon*' (almost always) as 'organic' or as 'equipped with organs'.[27] But a 'natural body' is always an elementary body in Aristotle.[28] And '*organikon*' in Aristotle never means 'equipped with organs' but always 'serving as an instrument'.[29] We should reconsider the interpretation of *De anima* and see that Aristotle's definition of the soul there is a comprehensive formula summing up what he said in his biological writings about *pneuma* and 'vital fire' and 'innate heat', to the effect that the soul is the entelechy of a natural body which serves

---

[20] Arist. *Gener. anim.* II 3, 736b35-737a1.

[21] Arist. *Resp.* 8, 474b10-12.

[22] Arist. *Resp.* 15, 478a16; cf. *Gener. anim.* III 11, 762a20.

[23] Arist. *Motu anim.* 10, 703a4-22; *Gener. anim.* V 8, 789b7-12.

[24] Arist. *Gener. anim.* II 4, 740b29-32; I 22, 730b11-23.

[25] Arist. *Anim.* II 2, 414a20-21 (A. Jannone).

[26] Arist. *Anim.* II 1, 412a27-28; b5-6.

[27] Cf. Alex. Aphrod. *Anim.* 16, 11; Philop. *In De an.* 217, 13 and the translations by R.D. Hicks (1907); W.S. Hett (1936); W. Theiler (1959); D.W. Hamlyn (1968); R. Bodeüs (1993). Ps. Simpl. takes '*organikon*' as 'instrumental' but his explanation is not aristotelian either. Cf. H.J. Blumenthal, *Aristotle and Neoplatonism in late Antiquity* (London 1996) 94.

[28] That *physikon sôma* also stands for 'elementary body' in *Anim.* II 1 is conclusively shown by a comparison of the words in 412a11: οὐσίαι δὲ μάλιστ' εἶναι δοκοῦσι τὰ σώματα, καὶ τούτων τὰ φυσικά with *Metaph.* Z 16, 1040b5-9. Cf. M. Furth, *Substance, form and psyche: an aristotelean metaphysics* (Cambridge 1988) 78.

[29] Thus in Arist. *Anim.* III 9, 432b18; b25. S. Everson, *Aristotle on perception* (Oxford 1997) 64, also rejects the translation 'equipped with organs' as being un-Aristotelian. J. Barnes, *CQ* 49 (1999) 121, suggests: 'Perhaps 412b5-6 refers to the whole body (and not to bodily parts) as being organ-like (and not as having organs)?'

it as *an instrument*. This 'natural body' is not a visible, concrete body, but a special, fine-material body which is precisely the instrument that enables the vegetative power of the soul to bring the visible body into being.

The main difference between Aristotle and Plato was that Aristotle distinguished more consistently and precisely between the activity of the intellect (*theôria, noèsis*) and the activity of the soul (*praxis, phronèsis*). The intellect's activity does not have any relationship with material entities. But the soul cannot realize any of its specific psychic activities without a (viz. an instrumental) body. This is the one (essential) difference of opinion between Aristotle and his teacher Plato.[30]

Hippolytus indeed offers a very interesting testimony to this interpretation of *De anima* II 1. For Hippolytus is familiar with Aristotle's definition of the soul in *De anima* II 1. He also knows about a treatise in three books on the soul. And he blames Aristotle for failing to present a clear theory of the soul.[31] We can note here that Hippolytus quotes the definition of the soul and at the same time says in book I that, in Aristotle's view, the soul survives after the death of the individual, but then dissolves into the ethereal sphere. So this must be either evidence of Hippolytus' great confusion or an indication that for him these two statements were not incompatible. In our discussion of Basilides' World-archon we shall see that Aristotle's definition of the soul returns in a highly unexpected place in Hippolytus' exposition.

My claim therefore is that what Hippolytus reports about Aristotle's psychology, that is to say that the soul consists of the fifth element and eventually dissolves in the celestial ether, contains valuable information and should be included in every collection of the 'fragments' of Aristotle's lost works. Hippolytus' text agrees with what we know about Aristotle's lost dialogue *Eudemus*, in which death is reinterpreted as a 'return home' and immortality in the proper sense is attributed to man's intellect. But it also agrees with the view of *De anima*, which presents the soul as an immaterial form-principle indissolubly linked to an 'instrumental body' (*pneuma* or its analogue).[32] Aristotle in *De anima* does *not* say that the soul is indissolubly

---

[30] Hipp. *Haer.* I 20, 3; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 1, 13, 33 = Arist. *Philos.* fr. 26 Ross; 25, 1 Gigon: 'Aristotelesque in tertio de philosophia libro multa turbat a magistro uno [Platone] dissentiens.' On this text, see A.P. Bos, *Cosmic and meta-cosmic theology in Aristotle's lost dialogues* (Leiden 1991) 193-195; Ital. ed. 323-326 and J. Pépin, *op. cit.* 140.

[31] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 19, 5-6.

[32] *Pneuma* is present only in human beings and higher kinds of animals with blood.

linked to the visible, gross-material body. The fundamental conception in *De anima*, too, is that on the death of the individual human being the soul leaves the visible body together with its instrumental body[33] and climbs up to the celestial spheres. In this process of the soul's 'liberation' it is able to realize its highest potential, namely its intellectual and really divine activity, the only activity for which it does not need an instrumental body.

Starting from a corrected interpretation of Aristotle's theory of soul, we need to comb through the patristic and Gnostic traditions to see where it was not Plato but Aristotle who exercised the greatest influence.

Outline of Basilides' Gnostic doctrine according to Hippolytus

Now I will briefly sketch the central notions in Basilides' theology as described by Hippolytus. In doing so I will try to indicate the connections between these notions, freely admitting that these connections result from my own reflection on the problems which could be linked to Basilides' position.

Basilides' theology of a transcendent non-being god

A philosophical or religious system is totally determined by its theological conception. Basilides' develops a philosophical notion of God in which God is hypercosmic and in no way forms part of the cosmos or shares in any element of the cosmos.[34] Of God it is said only that he is the ultimate cause, as deviser, of all things which have become. Significantly, 'every nature desires for him'.[35]

This theology is closest to the philosophical theology of Aristotle. There,

---

In lower kinds of animals and plants the soul-principle operates by means of vital heat.

[33] Cf. Arist. *Anim.* I 4, 408a28; I 5, 411b8; I 4, 409a29; *Resp.* 17, 479a22.

[34] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 20, 2-3; 21, 1-2; 22, 2-4. Cf. also X 14, 5 and VII 27, 7. Clem. *Str.* IV 165, 3 = Basil. Fr. 12 (Löhr) also uses the term ὑπερκόσμιος in connection with Basilides.

[35] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 8: ἐκείνου γὰρ δι' ὑπερβολὴν κάλλους καὶ ὡραιότητος πᾶσα φύσις ὀρέγεται, ἄλλη δὲ ἄλλως. cf. X 14, 3. This central proposition cannot be interpreted Platonistically as a desire for the world of Ideas, as W.A. Löhr does (*op. cit.* 306). It characterizes the transcendent God as First Unmoved Mover. Cf. Arist. *Metaph.* Λ 7, 1072a26-1072b4; *Phys.* I 9, 192a14-19 (so also W.A. Löhr, *op. cit.* 296 nt. 47 and 315 nt. 111). The 'natural desire' of all men for knowledge (Arist. *Metaph.* A 1, 980a20) is also an expression of this fundamental desire of all things that possess soul. Cf. C. Osborne, *op. cit.* 62.

too, God is the 'first cause', but only as final cause, as object of desire, and not as efficient cause in a strict sense.

By taking this starting-point, Basilides moves away from the theology of Plato's *Timaeus* and that of Genesis 1. This critical distance must be due to his choice of the Aristotelian position.[36] Aristotle had forcefully argued that an Intellect solely realizes thinking activity; and that productive activity is proper only to the soul and creatures with soul. Production is a working of matter by means of material instruments. The same applies to reproduction.

For this (philosophical) reason Basilides does not present the supreme God as the producer of the material cosmos. The activity of the supreme God is not manual work but intellectual work.

The World-seed

Wherever he can, Basilides therefore avoids calling God the 'Demiurge' (in the direct sense) of the visible cosmos. Nor does he term God the 'creator' of the visible cosmos. He opts for the metaphor of 'generation' in the biological sense. God is the sower of a World-seed,[37] as the principle of the visible cosmos as a Living Being. 'In (the) principle' God created heaven and earth. And 'in (the) principle' there was also the *Logos*.

Essential to the notion of a World-seed is that it contains form-principles which gradually 'develop'. Basilides uses for this the theme of the development of living creatures from an initial phase (in the form of seed or egg) to a mature phase. No one in Antiquity described the dynamics of this development earlier or in more detail than Aristotle.

Phases of world development

By choosing the notion of a World-seed, Basilides arrives at his notion of successive phases of development[38] in the generated cosmos. With some justification we can talk about Basilides' view of world history. An essential

---

[36] Cf. A.P. Bos, 'Cosmic and meta-cosmic theology in Greek philosophy and Gnosticism', in W.E. Helleman (ed.), *Hellenization revisited. Shaping a Christian response within the Greco-Roman world* (Lanham 1994) 1-21 and 'Philo of Alexandria: a platonist in the image and likeness of Aristotle', *Stud. Philon. Annual* 10 (1998) 66-86.

[37] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 21, 2-5; 22, 1-6. Cf. Löhr, *op. cit.* 308 n. 86. The 'biological' metaphor of 'begetting' seems a regression to the level of ancient mythical traditions. But it can also be seen as resulting from criticism of the metaphor of craftsmanship.

[38] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 1; 25, 3-5; 27, 5.

feature of this history is that it not only involves an increase in volume but, more importantly, an increase in the quality of life of the cosmos.

Basilides distinguishes at least three different levels of life: the purely animal life; human life governed by laws and commandments; and a life in perfect freedom. The ages of the world correspond with the phases of childhood, adolescence, and adulthood of the living creature which the cosmos is.

Development in knowledge of God

The phases in the development of the cosmos are connected by Basilides with the notion of phases in the development of knowledge of God.[39] All theologies that conceived of God as Demiurge or as Creator of the visible cosmos are presented as radically false, inadequate conceptions of God, characteristic of earlier phases of development in cosmic life.

So he does not spiritualize the anthropomorphic story of Genesis 1, as Philo of Alexandria does, but sees Old Testament theology, like Plato's theology, as *time*-related and *cosmos*-related.[40] Here the choice of an Aristotelian-type philosophical theology leads to a gap between Basilides' Gnostic (spiritual) theology and the theology of Genesis 1, a gap not found in Philo of Alexandria.

However, this approach is not anti-Jewish but pro-philosophical. The development of Gnosticism along lines which move away from the Jewish conception of God is not primarily due to anti-Jewish sentiments or disappointment in Messianic expectations. It is a consequence of the fundamental hellenistic philosophical conviction that theology must be thoroughly rational.

The final stage of the cosmic development

Basilides imagines the final stage of the cosmic evolution[41] as analogous to the transition described by Aristotle from human life aimed at practical activity to a truly free and divine life in *theôria*. Its essence is that the soul's potential for knowledge of the transcendent world is realized. This requires 'enlightenment'. That which has a potential for intellectuality must make contact with the Intellect-in-act.

---

[39] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 25, 2-4. Cf. Löhr, *op. cit.* 215.

[40] Nevertheless, Basilides discussed parts of Genesis 1 in a positive sense. Cf. Hipp. *Haer.* VII 22, 3 (quotation of Gen. 1:3) and 23, 1-3 (the notion of 'firmament').

[41] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 26, 1-27, 11.

Basilides describes this process in his discussion of the process of Enlightenment, which pervades all levels of the cosmos and so even penetrates as far as the sublunary sphere.

The tripartition of all reality according to Aristotle and according to Basilides

The division of reality which Hippolytus ascribes to Aristotle corresponds with the division which Hippolytus ascribes to Basilides, namely between cosmic reality and hypercosmic reality. Both go on to subdivide cosmic reality into supralunary reality and sublunary reality.

Diagram:

hypercosmic reality		transcendent God
cosmic reality	supralunary reality	Great Archon
	sublunary reality	Second Archon

Both Aristotle and Basilides present hypercosmic reality as free of all elements of which the cosmos is composed and as purely intellectual. Cosmic reality is somatic. Its supralunary sphere is ethereal and the sublunary sphere is composed of the four 'ordinary' elements.

Hippolytus is careful to emphasize that, in both views, Aristotle's *and* Basilides', the supralunary, ethereal sphere is characterized by Providence and divine government, as opposed to the sublunary sphere.[42] This is a distinction which many authors in Antiquity attributed to Aristotle and no one else,[43] and which links up well with the tripartition of reality sketched above.

This system is maintained so consistently in Hippolytus' account of both Aristotle and Basilides that it must be recognized to be deliberate. However, I have to admit that Hippolytus' Greek text in his *Refutatio* VII 19, 3 and 4 raises a serious problem here. This text says that Aristotle identified the

[42] Hipp. *Haer.* I 20, 6; VII 19, 2-3; 19, 4; 19, 7; 24, 3; 24, 5.

[43] Ps. Plu. *Plac.* II 3; Diog. L. V 32; Tatian. *Or.* 2; Athenag. *Leg.* 25; Clem. *Str.* 5, 14; Origen. *Cels.* 1, 21; 3, 75; Eus. *P.E.* XV 5, 1; Gr. Naz. *Or.* 27, 10; Epiph. *Haer.* 3, 2, 9; Thdt. *Affect.* 5, 77, 47; 6, 86, 7; Ambr. *Off.* 1, 13, 48; Chalcid. *In Ti.* 248. Cf. A.P. Bos, *Providentia divina. The theme of divine Pronoia in Plato and Aristotle* (Assen 1976) 5.

outer celestial sphere as the highest reality, and that it is a kind of *fifth* substance, free of all elements of which the cosmos consists, and that for Aristotle this 'fifth substance' is a kind of hypercosmic substance.

In his impressive book *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne (Ambroise, Exam. I 1, 1-4)*[44] J. Pépin explains this text in Hippolytus as attesting to an earlier Aristotelian position, that of the lost work *De philosophia*, in which Aristotle supposedly talked about two aspects of ether, viz. as the substance of the stars and planets *and* as a kind of hypercosmic substance. However, Pépin's view is entirely based on the hypothesis of a fundamental *development* in Aristotle's philosophy,[45] and makes something very complicated out of Aristotle's lucid theory of the fifth element, which raises serious questions even in Hippolytus' discussion.[46]

My alternative to Pépin's very scholarly argument is to replace the three occurrences of the word 'fifth' in Hippolytus' text by the word 'first' and to assume that Hippolytus ascribed to Aristotle the view that the outer celestial sphere is free of all elements which make up the cosmos and that he viewed it as hypercosmic substance and as 'first substance' or '*prôtè ousia*'. This reading would then have been 'corrected' by a later scribe who knew that in Aristotle the outerst sphere of the heaven formed part of the cosmos.

I also observe, rather apodictically, that both for Aristotle and for Basilides (in Hippolytus' discussion)

---

[44] Paris 1964.

[45] That hypothesis itself sprang forth from the wrong interpretation of the psychology of Aristotle's *De anima* and especially of the word ὀργανικόν in Aristotle's definition of the soul. I take the opportunity to suggest that the word '*operatorium*' that is used for the third of Aristotle's principles enumerated by Ambrose of Mailand in the text that forms the starting point for Pépin's research in this fascinating book, might be understood as the Latin equivalent of Aristotle's ὀργανικόν.

[46] The following problems inhere in this view: (a) a 'fifth' substance implies four others in an identical series. These can only be the four 'ordinary' elements; (b) the outer sphere is said to be 'free of all elements of which the cosmos consists'; so it must be incorporeal; (c) if Aristotle referred to the outer celestial sphere as 'fifth substance', this 'fifth substance' would have to be immaterial, which is at odds with I 20, 4; (d) if the outer sphere consists of an immaterial fifth substance, what are the celestial spheres from the moon to Saturn made up of?; (e) in I 20, 4 and X 7, 4 Hippolytus talks about a 'fifth body' as an Aristotelian dogma; (f) a substance which is emphatically called '*hyperkosmios*' does not provide a sound basis for attribution of a 'cosmic theology' to Aristotle; (g) Aristotle's theology or 'first philosophy' cannot have centered upon a 'fifth' substance.

(a) hypercosmic reality corresponds to the level of the pure Intellect-in-act;
(b) supralunary cosmic reality corresponds to the level of the divine beings with soul, and
(c) sublunary cosmic reality corresponds to the level of mortal creatures with soul and with visible (gross-material) bodies.

Basilides' doctrine of the Great Archon and his Son

Two dogmas are crucial in Hippolytus' account of Basilides' views, but they are also very puzzling. The first is his doctrine of the 'threefold Sonship' and the second the role of the Great Archon, who begets a Son. I will focus here on the dogma of 'the Great Archon'.[47] In my view, if we can understand the motives underlying this doctrine, it will be easier to grasp the doctrine of the 'threefold Sonship'.

I start by observing that modern studies of Hippolytus' exposition on Basilides have failed to give an adequate explanation of the above dogmas and their specific details.[48] The following questions have yet to be answered:

(a) why does Basilides talk about a 'threefold Sonship'?
(b) how can the World-seed contain a threefold Sonship which is 'of the same essence' as the transcendent God?
(c) is there any systematic relationship between the 'threefold Sonship' and the Son of the Great Archon, the Son of the Second Archon,[49] and the 'Sons of God' who need to be liberated from the World-seed?
(d) why does Basilides talk about 'a Son' of the Great Archon and 'a Son' of the Second Archon, and why are both more excellent than their begetter?
(e) why, after the great cosmic enlightenment, are the Great Archon and the Second Archon overcome by ignorance, in contrast to their Sons?

My inquiry assumes that the author of the Gnostic system had sound reasons for the details of his system, and that we cannot judge the value of Hippolytus' discussion until we have unearthed these reasons. (Though

---

[47] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 23-24.

[48] Cf. E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme* (Paris ²1925) 230; the explanation by G. Quispel, *art. cit.* 111-112, is implausible.

[49] Cf. W. Foerster, *art. cit.* 254: 'Ein besonderes Rätsel bildet die Gestalt der beiden Söhne der Archonten'.

it is by no means sure that we can do this, given the short supply of relevant information.)

I also note that Basilides' doctrine of the Great Archon has two very interesting features: (1) The cosmic Archon is not a malevolent figure. He has a number of positive characteristics and cannot be represented as an 'evil World-demiurge.'[50] He does suffer from ignorance and, consequently, from overestimation of his powers.[51] (2) The Great Archon is 'converted' in a process of acquiring Knowledge through (mediated) enlightenment.

Another special feature is that, after the great Enlightenment of all cosmic powers, a great 'Ignorance' comes upon the cosmos. This is a doctrine of the 'end of all things' which is very exceptional too, even in the curious world of ideas prevalent in the second century AD.

In Hippolytus' exposition the World-seed, deposited by the non-being God, brings forth the 'first Sonship' and the 'second Sonship', which, by themselves or aided by holy *Pneuma*, ascend to the divine Origin, that is the object of desire for all things in the World-seed. Hippolytus then talks about 'the Great Archon', who is characteristically distinct from 'the Sonship' in that the Archon is not 'of the same essence' as the transcendent God. He is a cosmic and not hypercosmic ruler since he rises only unto the holy *Pneuma*, which forms the separation between hypercosmic reality and the cosmos.

The Archon is therefore part of somatic reality, more specifically of ethereal, supralunary reality. An essential point is that the Great Archon believes he is autonomous, but in fact is merely the executor of what the transcendent God had planned.[52] We are told this right after the passage which says that the Great Archon 'first brought forth and begot a Son, much better and wiser than himself'.[53] This already suggests that the Son of the Great Archon is more akin to the transcendent God than to the Great Archon himself.

How are we to interpret this information? An essential distinction is between incorporeal reality and material, cosmic reality. Assuming that

---

[50] Cf. M.A. Williams, 'The demonizing of the Demiurge: the innovation of Gnostic myth', M.A. Williams a.o. (eds), *Innovation in religious traditions* (Berlin/New York 1992) 73-105.

[51] Cf. Löhr, *op. cit.* 67.

[52] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 23, 6! Cf. 22, 6; 24, 5.

[53] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 23, 5: ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐγέννησεν ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων υἱόν, ἑαυτοῦ πολὺ κρείττονα καὶ σοφώτερον.

incorporeal reality stands for the reality of the Intellect or *noèmata*,[54] we cannot interpret the Great Archon Platonistically as the incorporeal World-soul. The conception of the Great Archon is too cosmic and somatic for this.

But Hippolytus does make a connection between ether and soul when he says in I 20, 4 that, for Aristotle, man's individual soul survives after the individual's death and then dissolves in ether.

If we want to see the Great Archon as distinct from the transcendent God (= Intellect) in that he belongs to an inferior level of reality (namely that of the Soul), we should consider that, in Aristotle's view, the soul does not exist 'without *sôma*' and is 'something of a *sôma*'.[55] Aristotle also presented the celestial spheres as possessing (cosmic) life of the highest quality, not because he identified ether with the World-soul, but because he conceived of the celestial beings as beings with soul, whose bodies possessed the highest quality.[56]

We must therefore conclude that Basilides was unable to talk about a Great Archon *tout court* and was forced to introduce another entity, *the Son* of the Great Archon. In my view, H.J. Krämer was right when he concluded: 'Innerhalb des Kosmos entsteht nun ein μέγας ἄρχων—offenbar die Materie—mit der zugehörige Seele (ψυχή 24, 1) für die Himmels- und Aethersphäre'.[57]

That is to say, in Basilides' conception the cosmic Great Archon is a living being of the highest order in the reality of the cosmos, i.e. a living being with soul. But he remains a living being characterized by *sôma*.

In this connection it is so essential that Hippolytus' account clarifies the duality of the Demiurge and his Son by referring to the heart of Aristotle's doctrine of soul: the Son of the Archon has the same relationship with the Archon as, in Aristotle's view, the soul as entelechy has with the 'natural *organikon sôma*' of which the soul is the entelechy.[58] Hippolytus cannot

---

[54] Cf. Hipp. *Haer.* VII 25, 7.

[55] Arist. *Anim.* I 1, 403a5-8; II 4, 414a19-21.

[56] Cf. Arist. *Cael.* II 12, 292a18-292b25; II 2, 284b18-286a2; II 1.

[57] H.J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Platonismus zwischen Platon und Plotin* (Amsterdam 1964; ²1967) 235. I understand Krämer to mean not 'matter in general' but 'die Materie für die Himmelssphäre'.

[58] Hipp. *Haer.* VII 24, 1-2: Αὕτη (δ') ἔστιν ἡ κατ' Ἀριστοτέλην σώματος φυσικοῦ ὀργανικοῦ ἐν(τ)ελέχεια, ψυχὴ ἐνεργοῦσα τῷ σώματι, ἧς δίχα τὸ σῶμα ἐργάζεσθαι οὐδὲν δύναται μεῖζον καὶ ἐπιφανέστερον καὶ δυνατώτερον καὶ σοφώτερον. ὃν λόγον οὖν Ἀριστοτέλης ἀποδέδωκε περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος πρότερος Βασιλείδης περὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ἄρχοντος καὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν υἱοῦ διασαφεῖ. τὸν τε γὰρ υἱὸν ὁ ἄρχων κατὰ Βασιλείδην γεγε(ν)νηκεν, τήν τε ψυχὴν (ὡς) ἔργον καὶ ἀποτέλεσμα [ὡς] φησιν εἶναι ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης φυσικοῦ σώματος

possibly have devised this explanation by himself. I believe that Basilides must have given some kind of hint in this direction.

In that case, however, we must understand rightly what the text exactly says about the relationship between 'entelechy' and 'natural *sôma organikon*'. Hippolytus' text makes it clear that he does not view the soul as the 'entelechy of a natural body that is equipped with organs' but as the 'entelechy of a natural body which serves *as an instrument* (for the soul)'. This is not just a confused, eccentric approach to Aristotle's definition of the soul. Hippolytus gives the *earlier*, and in my view historically correct, explanation of Aristotle's definition of the soul.[59]

Aristotle *never* viewed the soul as the entelechy of a visible body equipped with organs, but always as the entelechy of a special, fine-material natural body which serves the soul as an instrument. Indeed, Hippolytus' text on the Great Archon also provides an important argument for the claim that Aristotle regarded his definition of the soul in *De anima* II 1 as being applicable not only to the sphere of mortal living creatures, but also to the beings with soul that inhabit the celestial sphere.[60]

In Basilides' system, the Great Archon is a living being of the highest quality, but also a being with soul, and therefore a being that is characterized by *development*, under the guidance of the soul as entelechy. The word 'entelechy' already indicates that it is the principle which directs this development towards a *goal*, which is the end-point of the development. The end-point of this development, for a being with capacity for intellectuality, is the realization of intellectuality, i.e. the realization of a mode of existence which has no relationship with corporeal reality.

This insight provides the key to other details of Basilides' cosmogony

---

ὀργανικοῦ ἐντελέχειαν. ὡς οὖν ἡ ἐντελέχεια διοικεῖ τὸ σῶμα, οὕτως ὁ υἱὸς διοικεῖ κατὰ Βασιλείδην τὸν ἀρρήτων ἀρρητότερον θεόν. The text given here differs slightly from that of M. Marcovich. A.J. Festugière, *op. cit.* 249, says of this passage: 'Ce fils est l'aristotélicienne entéléchie du corps physique pourvu d'organes, [à] savoir l'âme qui opère avec le corps . . .', but it seems out of the question that Hippolytus was thinking of a 'corps pourvu d'organes'. In fact, all translators of Hippolytus, in line with the traditional interpretation of Arist. *Anim.* II 1, translate '*organikon*' here as 'organic' or as 'with organs'.

[59] This earlier interpretation of Aristotle's definition of the soul is also found in Plut. *Plat. quaest.* 8, 1006D and Diog. L. V 33. See my paper 'Plutarch's testimony to an earlier interpretation of Aristotle's definition of the soul', in A. Pérez Jiménez (a.o.) eds., *Plutarco, Platón y Aristóteles, Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Intern. Plutarch Society*, (Madrid 1999) 535–548.

[60] Despite the claim of Philop. In *De an.* 239, 37-38.

and eschatology. The great cosmic 'enlightenment' is the end of the cosmic development and means: the realization of the awareness of transcendence by all those living beings who possess the potential for this. These are the Sons of the cosmic Archons and the 'pneumatics' among the living creatures in the sublunary sphere. Precisely the fact that, in the grande finale of the cosmic development, the Great Archon and the Second Archon are overcome by ignorance (but not their Sons!)[61] supports the view that the Sons stand for the immaterial entelechy which, after enlightenment, detaches itself from its instrumental body[62] and is then united with the hypercosmic First and Second Sonship. This point, however, will be discussed at another occasion.

Conclusion

In a recent article I. Mueller assessed Hippolytus of Rome's treatment of the Gnostic Basilides in his *Refutatio* as follows:

"Hippolytus's treatment of Basilides as a proponent of Aristotelianism must seem to most modern readers a bizarre interpretation of a bizarre doctrine. But, whatever one thinks of the reliability of Hippolytus's account of Basilides, there can be no doubt that doctrines equally bizarre were in the air in the second and third century . . .'. However, Mueller concludes: "Everything is, as we have seen, distorted by Hippolytus's polemical aims. I cannot, then, conclude by promoting Hippolytus as a second Alexander of Aphrodisias nor even as one among many interpreters of Aristotle. He can, however, serve as a reminder of how immediate intellectual concerns can lead people to misconstrue and misuse the words of even the greatest authors. And that, perhaps, is a reminder no less important today than it ever was".[63]

I am not convinced by Mueller's discussion, least of all by his conclusion. True enough, Hippolytus' work has a polemic thrust. He makes no secret of it. But it seems extremely doubtful whether he would advance his cause by producing inferior work that could be easily dismissed by his

---

[61] W.A. Löhr, *op. cit.* 299-300, fails to note this.

[62] Just as a seaman leaves his ship when he has ended his voyage. Cf. Arist. *Anim.* II 1, 413a8-9.

[63] I. Mueller, 'Hippolytus, Aristotle, Basilides', 157. See also *idem*, 'Hippolytus retractatus. A discussion of C. Osborne, *Rethinking early Greek philosophy*', *Oxf. Stud. in Anc. Philos.* 7 (1989) 233-251. A.J. Festugière, *op. cit.* 251 and J. Mansfeld, *op. cit.* 146 have been as critical as Mueller.

contemporaries. And Mueller's reproach that Hippolytus' comparison of the cosmic Archon and his Son with Aristotle's definition of the soul 'is based on a straightforward misunderstanding of the Aristotelean formula for the soul'[64] turns against himself. The texts of Plutarch, *Platonicae quaestiones* 8 and Diogenes Laertius V 33 show that Mueller's own position 'is based on a straightforward misunderstanding of the Aristotelean formula for the soul'.

Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit.
E-mail: A.P.Bos@th.vu.nl

[64] I. Mueller, *art. cit.* (1994) 150.

"BY FAITH ALONE": A TECHNICAL TERM IN GREGORY OF NYSSA

BY

MARTIN LAIRD

In his well-known study of Gregory of Nyssa, Walter Völker maintains that Gregory of Nyssa employs the term πίστις in a manner which departs from the Alexandrian tradition to which he was heir. Whereas the Alexandrian tradition tended to consider πίστις to be supplanted ultimately by γνῶσις in the epistemological ascent to God, Gregory of Nyssa, exalts πίστις over γνῶσις.[1] Völker also maintains, however, that Gregory does not give the term a precise, technical meaning. Like Philo before him, Gregory of Nyssa bestows on the term πίστις a wide range of meaning with no technical sense accorded it.[2]

Manlio Simonetti, by contrast, views the matter differently; in his edition of Gregory's *De vita Moysis*, he indeed identifies πίστις as a technical term.[3] While Simonetti indicates several references to πίστις in *De vita Moysis*, he does not, however, elaborate in his valuable notes what this technical meaning involves. The purpose of the present article is to identify and describe this use of πίστις and to argue, in contrast to Völker, that in certain contexts and grammatical morphologies, πίστις functions as

---

[1] W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker* (Wiesbaden, 1955), p. 141, n. 7: "In dieser hohen Wertung des Glaubens verläßt Gregor die Bahnen der christlichen Alexandriner". In his recent study of Gregory, F. Dünzl follows Völker; see *Braut und Bräutigam: Die Auslegung des Canticum durch Gregor von Nyssa* (Tübingen, 1993), pp. 295-296.

[2] Ibid., p. 140: "Könnten wir bei Philo beobachten, daß das Wort πίστις kein fester terminus technicus ist, sondern in verschiedenen Bedeutungen verwandt wird, so ist Gregor wenig interessiert". See also his study of Philo, *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrinen* (Leipzig, 1938), p. 244, n. 1. R. Hübner speaks along similar lines in *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Leiden, 1974), p. 189: "Glaube kann auf diesen Aussagen [sc. *Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, GNO X, i, 10, 5-7] sicherlich eine sehr viel unfassendere Bedeutung. . . . Glaube kann auf diese Weise ein weites Bedeutungsfeld haben".

[3] Gregorio di Nissa, *La Vita di Mosè*, ed. and trans. Manlio Simonetti., Scrittori Greci e Latini (Milan, 1984).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

a technical term in Gregory of Nyssa's apophatic vocabulary.[4] In these apophatic contexts, moreover, πίστις will be shown to have a precise function: it is the faculty of divine union;[5] it renders the soul a dwelling place of God; it does what διάνοια can never do: grasp the ungraspable nature of God.

The value of such a study, focused as it is on certain usages of πίστις in Gregory of Nyssa, can be expressed as follows. Not a few scholars have noted the important role which πίστις plays in Gregory of Nyssa's understanding of how the soul unites with God, but have not given it sustained attention.[6] Moreover, in a hellenistic philosophical milieu which, at least since Plato's famous allegory of the line, looked with derision upon the capacity of πίστις to be of any use in achieving contact with the Good,[7] Gregory's treatment of πίστις exhibits a remarkable exaltation of πίστις over γνῶσις and stands out in bold relief. Finally, having argued for a technical sense of πίστις and stressed in particular its role in apophatic union with God, we are in a position to make an observation regarding Mühlenberg's claim that Gregory of Nyssa does not allow for divine union.[8]

---

[4] This is not to say, however, that Völker, or for that matter Hübner, are completely mistaken in their claim that Gregory uses the term in a wide, non-technical sense. Indeed the word abounds in Gregory's written corpus: the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* produces some 350 matches for πιστεύω and πίστις in the *Contra Eunomium* alone and 137 in the *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum*; its meanings range from notional assent (e.g., *Contra Eunom.* I, 23, Gregorii Nysseni Opera [= GNO], ed. W. Jaeger [Leiden, 1960-], 88, 23; *Contra Eunom.* I, 219, GNO I, 90, 14; *Contra Eunom.* I, 220, GNO I, 90, 24.) and considered opinion (e.g., *Contra Eunom.* I, 376, GNO I, 137, 22; *Contra Eunom.* I, 384, GNO I, 139, 16; *Contra Eunom.* 406, GNO I, 145, 18) to an item of faith or creed (e.g., *Contra Eunom.* I, 122, GNO I, 64, 9; *Contra Eunom.* I, 127, GNO I, 65, 18; *Contra Eunom.* I, 137, GNO I, 68, 15.

[5] The term "*faculté*" is used by J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique: Essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de Saint Grégoire de Nysse*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1954), p. 146.

[6] H. von Balthasar, *Présence et pensée: Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris, 1942), p. 67; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, pp. 143 ff.; W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, p. 141; M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique: Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris, 1983), pp. 62-63; V. Harrison, *Grace and Freedom according to Gregory of Nyssa* (Lewiston, NY: 1992), pp. 64 and 66-67; F. Dünzl, *Braut und Bräutigam* (Tübingen), pp. 295-297; B. Pottier, *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse: Étude systématique du "Contre Eunome" avec traduction inédite des extraits d'Eunome* (Namur, 1994), pp. 207-209 et passim; C. Deslavo, *L'"oltre" nel presente: La filosofia dell'uomo in Gregorio di Nissa* (Milan, 1996), pp. 215-235, while I am in agreement with much of Desalvo's research on Gregory, I believe she has not given sufficient recognition to the apophatic character of Gregorian πίστις.

[7] See *Rep.* VI, 511 d-e.

[8] In stabilizing the technical sense of πίστις, I will focus on three works: an early

In inscriptiones Psalmorum

In this early commentary,[9] Gregory uses πίστις in a manner which adumbrates what will come to characterize its use as a technical term: πίστις in an apophatic context. Commenting on the title "for the hidden things of the son", Gregory states: "For how truly is that hidden which is incomprehensible, invisible, and which transcends every thought which conveys direct apprehension, although he who draws near through faith achieves the goal of victory."[10]

For our purposes it is important to note the role exercised by πίστις in achieving the goal of victory: hidden from understanding, sight and thought, God can yet be approached through πίστις. While Gregory does not pursue in any detail exactly what is involved in this approach of πίστις beyond comprehension, vision, and thought, πίστις clearly has an access which comprehension does not have. Moreover, it is important to note the apophatic context in which πίστις is situated; albeit muted and with none of the aphairetic gestures which will characterize other texts which we shall presently consider, it is none the less present in such phrases as ἀκατανόητον, ἀόρατον, and ὑπερκείμενον καταληπτικῆς ἐπινοίας. Indeed this location of πίστις within clusters of apophatic terminology[11] and motifs will remain a consistent indicator of the technical meaning which πίστις accrues in the apophatic dimension of Gregory's thought.

---

work, *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*; the *Contra Eunomium*, considered to be something of a watershed in his career; and the *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum*, a later work concerned explicitly with the theme of divine union. Other texts, such as *Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi* and *De vita Moysis* could also have been used, but without the examples of exalted πίστις evinced especially in the *Contra Eunomium* and the *Commentarius in Canticum conticorum*, the technical sense of πίστις in these works is less clear.

[9] On the dating of this work, see J. Daniélou, "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse", *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966) 159-169; M.-J. Rondeau, "Exégèse du Psautier et anabase spirituelle chez Grégoire de Nysse" in J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser, eds., *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), 517-531; idem, "D'où vient la technique exégétique utilisée par Grégoire de Nysse dans son traité 'Sur les titres des psaumes?'," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris, 1974), pp. 263-287; R. Heine, *Gregory of Nyssa's Treatise on the Inscriptions on the Psalms* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 8-11.

[10] *In inscrip. Psalm.*, GNO V, 82, 25-83, 2: κρύφιον γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐκεῖνό ἐστιν τὸ ἀκατανόητόν τε καὶ ἀόρατον καὶ πάσης ὑπερκείμενον καταληπτικῆς ἐπινοίας, ᾧπερ ὁ προσεγγίσας διὰ τῆς πίστεως εἰς τὸ τῆς νίκης ἔφθασε τέλος. Translation by R. Heine. p. 135.

[11] As Françoise Vinel has observed, this stringing together of negative terms, with or without the alpha privative, typifies Gregory's apophatic language; see F. Vinel, trans.

Contra Eunomium

The *Contra Eunomium* reveals three noteworthy examples of πίστις in a reserved or technical sense. The first occurs about midway through Book I of his massive refutation of Eunomius.[12] Gregory argues forcefully that because God is beyond all time and measurement, the discursive mind, bound to the created world of space and time, cannot pass beyond the border of finitude and arrive at the infinite. Because the discursive mind must have something to grasp, if it approaches the infinite, it "must fall back from any side of this incomprehensible existence and seek in the kindred ages and in the creation which hold its kindred and congenial sphere."[13] As Gregory continues this section the apophatic character of his language becomes more pronounced. God is not in space, nor in time but before these and above these in an ineffable way. God is "immeasureable by ages; without the accompaniment of time; seated and resting in itself without associations with past or future, since there is nothing beside it and nothing beyond it."[14]

The text merits considerable comment, but for our purposes it is sufficient to observe the apophatic context which Gregory has created, as we see Gregory once again string together in typical fashion a cluster of apophatic terms: "ineffable", "immeasurable", "without time", "nothing before", "nothing beyond."[15] The entire orientation of the text, moreover, is the unknowability of God. In this clearly established apophatic context Gregory states

---

and P. Alexander, ed., *Homelies sur l'Ecclesiaste*, Sources Chrétiennes (= SC) 416 (Paris, 1996), p. 388, n. 2.

[12] On points of literary structure of Book I see B. Pottier, *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse*, pp. 31-35 and pp. 413-424; n.b., p. 208, where Pottier counters Mühlenberg's claim [*Unendlichkeit Gottes* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 98-100] that the *Contra Eunomium* is something of "patchwork."

[13] *Contra Eunom.* I, 369, GNO I, 136, 4-7 (trans. Library of Post Nicene Fathers, p. 69). This is not the only time Gregory will draw upon this imagery of falling back or slipping away as a result of the discursive mind's attempt to grasp what is beyond intellect and then seek comfort and security on a lower level. This is expressed even more graphically, and perhaps autobiographically at *In Eccl.*, SC, VII, 8, 100-104 and *De beat.* VI, GNO VII, ii, 136, 25-137, 26. Cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* VI, 9, 3.

[14] Ibid., 371, GNO I, 136, 14-16.

[15] F. Vincl, p. 388, n. 2; for a more extensive and more general discussion of apophatic language in the Cappadocians see J. Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven, 1993), pp. 40-56, 200-214 et passim.

in what way God can be known: "διὰ μόνης τῆς πίστεως θεωρεῖται."[16] Because God is beyond space and time and, therefore, beyond concepts, Gregory is not going to suggest that God can be approached by that aspect of the mind which contemplates the intelligibles.[17] Gregory suggests instead something along the same lines as we saw in *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*: one draws near, indeed knows in some sense, the incomprehensible God, not by means of διάνοια but by means of πίστις.

An obvious question immediately suggests itself: how then to interpret the paradoxical statement that follows? Gregory has just said that God is known through faith alone. He says just a few lines further on, however, that God is known only in the impossibility of knowing.[18] This coincidence of knowing and not knowing, or as von Balthasar has put it "*une mystérieuse et parallèle croissance de l'ignorance et du savoir*",[19] is a motif which Gregory will employ on a number of occasions.[20] Is Gregory contradicting himself in the space of a few lines? Rather, Gregory is establishing a connection between πίστις in the technical, apophatic sense in which he has just used it, and this coincidence of knowing and unknowing, what Augustine terms "*docta ignorantia*",[21] which has played such an important role in neoplatonic mystical theory, Christian and non-Christian.[22] That is to say,

---

[16] *Contra Eunom.* I, 371, GNO I, 136, 17.

[17] *Contra Eunom.* I, GNO I, 371, 4. It is well to note that Gregory uses in *De virginitate* a quite similar phraseology to describe David in "that blessed ecstasy" (*De virg.*, SC, X, 2, 6); but it is important to observe that David is borne aloft to a *discursive* contemplation of the intelligibles (νοητῶν θεωρίαν) achieved διὰ μόνης τῆς διανοίας (*De virg.*, SC, X, 2, 8-9). Our argument is that it is the non-discursive contemplation that is designated by "διὰ μόνης τῆς πίστεως θεωρεῖται."

[18] *Contra Eunom.* I, 373, GNO I, 137, 5-6: ἐν μόνῳ τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι καταληφθῆναι γινωσκομένη.

[19] H. von Balthasar, *Présence et pensée*, p. 79.

[20] E.g., *De vita Moysis*, SC, II, 163, 6-7 and *In Cant.* VI, GNO VI, 183, 2-5. While not a few authors previous to Gregory, both Christian and non-Christian, have spoken of the coincidence of knowledge and ignorance, no other author before Gregory seems to resolve this paradox through πίστις. See Philo, *De post.*, V, 15; Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.9.4; Porphyry, *Comm. in Parm.* II, 15-16; Basil *Ep.* 234, 2 (PG 32, 869 C); idem, *De fide*, 3 (PG 31, 684 C); Gregory Nazianzenus, *Orat.* 38, 7 (PG 36, 317 C); idem, *Orat.* 45,3 (PG 36, 628 A). To follow this tradition beyond Gregory of Nyssa see Denys the Areopagite, *Ep.* 1 (PG 3, 1065 A); idem, *Theol. myst.* II (PG 3, 1025 A).

[21] Augustine, *Ep.* 130, 15, 28. Gandillac, "Docte Ignorance", *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, s.v., gives the impression that Nicholas of Cusa introduced this term.

[22] A point very well demonstrated by S. Lilla, "La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino", *Helikon* XXII-XXVII (1982-1987), 235,

πίστις is another way of expressing that unknowing higher than knowing, which has abandoned all concepts and images in the face of incomprehensible mystery.

The Migration of Abraham

When Gregory comments on the Old Testament patriarchs he usually follows the Alexandrian exegetical tradition to which he was heir. The figure of Abraham, however, is an exception to this. Gregory's commentary on the patriarch constitutes one of his "most personal interpretations, because the figure of Abraham illustrates and establishes his doctrine on the incomprehensibility of the divine nature",[23] and it is precisely here where we find one of Gregory's most important uses of πίστις. In his description of the father of the faith's ascent we see πίστις clearly established in a context of *anabasis* and *aphairesis* as the means by which the mind is united to God at the apex of an epistemological ascent.

Gregory's depiction of Abraham is something of a composite, for Gregory reads the story of Gen 12, 1-5 ff., through the lens of Heb 11, 8.[24] Indeed it is the Letter to the Hebrews's version of the Abraham story, which turns the discussion in the direction of πίστις (by having the patriarch set out on his journey by means of πίστις)[25] and which Gregory takes up and structures along the lines of an epistemological ascent. Therefore, instead of leaving behind his land, Abraham sets out on a journey in search of

---

n. 59 and idem, "Diogini" in *La Mistica: fenomenologia e riflessione teologica*, 2 vols., eds. E. Ancilli and M. Paparozzi (Rome, 1984), pp. 381-387, esp. pp. 385-586.

[23] M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, pp. 94-96 at 95; on Gregory's relationship to Alexandrian exegesis generally see I. Gargano, *La teoria di Gregorio di Nissa sul Cantico dei Cantici* (Rome, 1981), pp. 45-95; M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o Allegoria: Un Contributo alla Storia dell'Esegesi Patristica* (Rome, 1985), pp. 145-156; see also idem, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, trans. J. Hughes, eds. A. Bergquist and M. Bockmuehl (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 65-67.

[24] At *Contra Eunom.* II, 85, GNO I, 251, 22-25. Gregory implies that he is reading Gen 12, 1-4 through Heb 11, 8. Conforming to oriental tradition, Gregory did not contest Paul's authorship of the letter (see M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, p. 202).

[25] The entire chapter of Hebrews 11 is an exaltation of faith which provides the various *loci* of great deeds accomplished "by means of πίστις". One cannot overlook the fact that πίστις appears as an instrumental dative. An instrumental sense of πίστις appears with great emphasis some 20 times in the course of a single chapter: 18 of these occur as an instrumental dative, the largest number being attributed to Abraham and Moses (3 each), and 2 occur as the object of the preposition διά. It is precisely

divine knowledge and leaves himself behind and the realm of base and earthly thoughts.[26] And so Abraham ascends.

Abraham goes forth at divine behest from the earthly and base thoughts as someone eager for knowledge of God. He lifts up his mind and leaves behind all commerce with the senses.[27] The first part of this ascent is characterized by a two-fold movement of *anabasis* and *aphairesis*. These two motifs, along with apophatic terminology, will characterize those contexts in which πίστις takes on a technical function.

We see the *anabasis* in the ascensional imagery of going out (ἐξέρχομαι), of lifting up (ὑπεραίρω) the mind, and being raised up (ἐπήρθη) to profound knowledge. The other side of this coin of ascent is seen in the aphairetic imagery of letting go (καταλείπω) of sense perception. With clearly apophatic language Gregory emphasizes that this ascent involves "*not* the workings of the senses, . . . *not* seeing and *not* hearing."[28] Thus Abraham is lifted up (ἐπήρθην) to profound knowledge (γνῶσις) of God and knows as much of God as is possible to attain.[29]

Gregory immediately equates with the meaning of II Cor 5, 7 ("we walk by faith—διὰ πίστεως—and not by sight") the mind's movement towards a certain knowledge of God away from what can be grasped through the senses. By quoting this Pauline text as he does, Gregory is saying that this ascent to knowledge of God is tantamount to moving out in faith, much as Abraham does in Hebrews's version of the story,[30] indeed tantamount to an ascent in πίστις. At this point in Abraham's ascent, γνῶσις does not supplant πίστις, rather the two coincide.[31]

Setting out in faith and walking by faith, the father of the faith has come to a certain knowledge of God in creation, a knowledge which, however, has not supplanted faith, and he continues his ascent to what lies beyond all knowing.[32] He grows in discursive knowledge as he ascends

---

these biblical forms which, as we shall see, Gregory transfers to an epistemological sense according to the neoplatonic *esprit du temps* and incorporates them as technical terms of his apophatic vocabulary.

[26] *Contra Eunom.* II, 86 GNO I, 252, 1-3.

[27] See ibid., 3-9.

[28] See ibid., 6-7: μηδενὶ . . . αἴσθησιν . . . ἀοράτων, . . . μήτε ἀκοῆς περιηχούσης. . . .

[29] Ibid., 10-14.

[30] Heb. 11, 8a.

[31] Here Gregory departs from the traditional Alexandrian view which tends to supplant πίστις by γνῶσις. See Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa*, p. 141, n. 7 and F. Dünzl, *Braut und Bräutigam*, pp. 295-296.

[32] *Contra Eunom.* II, 88, GNO I, 252, 23-24.

by means of πίστις. Abraham moves beyond the Chaldaean philosophy, which is built on appearances, and beyond what can be known by the senses. He grasps by reason all qualities attributed to the divine nature: power, goodness, that God is without beginning, that God is not circumscribed by any limit. He uses all these as steps on his heavenly journey but realizes that they fall short of what he seeks.

At this point in his journey there ensues an aphairetic process of letting go and purificaton, and the role of πίστις changes notably. Abraham begins to leave behind (ὑπολείπω) the knowledge he has acquired; he renounces all concepts and images that represent God. Having done this, Abraham acquires πίστις which is unmixed and purified of all concepts.[33]

In this apophatic state, unmixed (ἀμιγῆ) and purified of images and concepts, in which Abraham is speechless (ἄφωνος) and incapable (ἀνενέργετος) of explaining what his mind has seen,[34] is πίστις capable of anything? Indeed, in this apophatic context of epistemological ascent, which has brought the mind through knowledge to silence, we see the specific function of πίστις; Gregory says that πίστις "unites the searching mind to the incomprehensible nature of God."[35]

Union, however, is not the only function which πίστις performs; while it unites it also mediates to the mind knowledge of a discursive sort: namely, that God is greater than any symbol by which he can be known.[36] Hence, while we are in the context of an apophatic ascent of the mind, and πίστις marks the zenith of this ascent, grasping in union the incomprehensible nature, the mind is not left with nothing; πίστις gives the discursive mind something of what it "knows."[37]

---

[33] Ibid., 253, 11-14; see Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, p. 96.

[34] Ibid., 21-22.

[35] Ibid., 25-28: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλως προσεγγίσαι θεῷ, μὴ πίστεως μεσιτευούσης καὶ συναπτούσης δι' ἑαυτῆς τὸν ἐπιζητοῦντα νοῦν πρὸς τὴν ἀκατάληπτον φύσιν. An interesting quote from Philo, indicating the capacity of πίστις to unite with God, suggests itself as a possible source for Gregory: "What then is the cementing substance? Do you ask, what? Piety, surely and faith: for these virtues adjust and unite (ἑνοῦσιν) the intent of the heart to the incorruptible Being: as Abraham when he believed is said to "come near God" (Gen. 18, 23)". *Abr.* 132, trans. F. Colson and G. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1959). My thanks to Mlle. Mariette Canévet for drawing my attention to this text.

[36] Ibid., 14-17.

[37] See Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, p. 66, where she observes this dimension of union by means of πίστις.

Gregory concludes his discussion of the migration of Abraham as he began it, by turning to Pauline faith. The patriarch left behind meddlesome knowledge (πολυπραγμοσύνη) and arrived at a stance of faith. It is important to keep in mind the context in which Gregory makes this claim. This is not πίστις in opposition to γνῶσις; nor is it the irrational πίστις of, for example, Porphyry's anti-Christian derision.[38] It is an exalted πίστις, higher than γνῶσις, the apex of apophatic ascent, having shed all images, concepts and movement. It is this exalted state which Gregory says is tantamount to that Pauline πίστις which renders one just before God.[39] That Paul aligns πίστις and justification is something of a hallmark of the Pauline tradition and beyond.[40] But that this justification made by πίστις should be aligned with the unashamedly apophatic ascent of the mind to God, attaining union with God, is something of an innovation on the part of Gregory of Nyssa.

Commentarius in Canticum canticorum

As noteworthy as these select passages from the *Contra Eunomium* are, Gregory's fifteen homilies on the Song of Songs offer yet more telling examples of exalted, technical πίστις. Most noteworthy among these is found in Homily Six, and by now one might suspect where this occurrence of πίστις is to be found: in the apophatic ascent of the bride.

The Ascent of the Bride

Having presented in the Prologue to Homily Six his well-known metaphyscial paradigm, Gregory begins his commentary on Sg 3, 1: "on my bed at night I sought him whom my soul loved". Like Moses at Ex 20, 21, the bride is "in the darkness where God was".[41] Her entry into this darkness marks an apophatic ascent in which she moves through various levels of knowledge in order to find, at last, the beloved by means of πίστις. Let us consider this ascent.

The search for the beloved forces the bride to forsake (καταλείπω) sense perception; she is thus embraced by the divine night and seeks him hidden

---

[38] See Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, SC I, 1, 11, 4-5; I, 2, 4, 2-3; I, 3, 1, 5-6.

[39] *Contra Eunom.* II, 92, GNO II, 253, 28-30; cf Gen. 15, 6 and Rom. 4, 3.

[40] See, e.g., Gal. 3, 6; Jas. 2, 3.

[41] *In Cant.* VI, GNO VI, 181, 6.

in the darkness.[42] "Then," she says "I felt love for the one whom I desired, but my beloved escaped the grasp of my thoughts.[43] Yet she clearly seeks him "in order to know his substance (οὐσία)";[44] therefore the bride continues her ascent: "she arises and in her mind traverses the intellectual and celestial nature."[45] These levels of knowledge are the city, marketplace and street (Sg 3, 2) through which the bride goes in search of her beloved, but she does not find him at these higher levels of knowledge either. She even asks the angelic rank, "have you perhaps seen him whom my soul loves?"[46] The angels keep silent, and the bride construes this silence to mean that the one whom she seeks cannot be grasped (ἄληπτος) by the mind.[47] With this the ascent moves yet higher as she realizes that the one whom she seeks is known in not knowing.[48] And so, with another aphairetic gesture of letting go (καταλείπω), the bride abandons even her knowledge of intelligibles. Gregory says of the bride, "she abandons everything she has found."[49] But just further on she says by what means she does find her beloved: "I left behind every creature and passed by every intelligible thing in creation and leaving behind all comprehension, I found the beloved by faith (τῇ πίστει)."[50] Once found "by the grasp of faith" the bride says, "I will never let him go until he comes into my chamber."[51]

This ascent began as a search for knowledge (γνῶσις), knowledge of the beloved's essence, and it is precisely her desire for knowledge which characterizes this ascent from beginning to end: the bride felt love for her desired one (ποθούμενος), even though he escaped her thoughts; the one who is sought (ζητούμενος) is known by not knowing; the bride sets forth with the curiosity of her mind and searches the city for the beloved. Indeed all the language of seeking and grasping serves to underscore the intensity

---

[42] Ibid., 181, 13-14.

[43] Ibid., 181, 15-16.

[44] Ibid., 181, 17-18.

[45] Ibid., 182, 5-6.

[46] Ibid., 182, 14-15.

[47] Ibid., 182, 15-17.

[48] Ibid., 183, 2-3: τὸ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ μὴ καταλαμβάνεσθαι τί ἐστιν ὅτι ἔστι γινωσκόμενον . . . Cf. the similar formulation in *Contra Eunom.* I, 343, GNO I, 137, 5-6.

[49] Ibid., 183, 1-2.

[50] Ibid., 183, 6-8: . . . ἀφεῖσα πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν καὶ παρελθοῦσα πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῇ κτίσει νοούμενον καὶ πᾶσαν καταληπτικὴν ἔφοδον καταλιποῦσα, τῇ πίστει εὗρον τὸν ἀγαπώμενον. . . .

[51] Ibid., 183, 8-10: οὐκέτι μεθήσω τῇ τῆς πίστεως λαβῇ τοῦ εὑρεθέντος ἀντεχομένη, ἕως ἂν ἐντὸς γένηται τοῦ ἐμοῦ ταμιείου.

of her desire for knowledge. At the summit of this ascent, however, we find not γνῶσις but πίστις. Has the bride's desire for knowledge ended in frustration? Is πίστις, then, merely a "consolation prize"?[52] By placing πίστις at the zenith of an epistemological ascent Gregory clearly does not intend us to think this but rather that πίστις is itself a form of knowledge that resolves the *coincidentia oppositorum* of knowing and unknowing.[53]

The bride's finding the beloved by the "grasp of faith" marks a significant change of language on the part of Gregory. Previous to this grasp by means of πίστις the beloved was clearly ἄληπτος—not capable of being grasped by the mind,[54] but after the aphairetic process of abandoning all knowledge, the beloved is paradoxically ληπτός. For Gregory, then, the divine οὐσία is ungraspable (ἄληπτος) on the level of the discursive mind (διάνοια), but clearly graspable (ληπτός) on the level of πίστις.

What is the result of the grasp of faith? Through the bride's grasp of faith the beloved enters into her chamber. Gregory identifies this chamber as the bride's heart.[55] Hence, through this union of bride and beloved in the grasp of faith, the bride herself becomes God's dwelling place, thus returning to the original state for which she was created.[56]

As in the previous texts we have examined, and especially in the ascent of Abraham, the ascent of the bride in Homily Six reveals a strikingly similar and likewise precise use of πίστις: the means by which apophatic union with the incomprehensible God is achieved. This union, moreover, is often expressed in the imagery of indwelling. To consider this aspect of the function of πίστις let us turn to other Homilies on the Song.

---

[52] V. Harrison, *Grace and Freedom according to Gregory of Nyssa*, p. 67.

[53] In her recent study of the early history of negative theology D. Carabine, *The Unknown God: Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: Plato to Eriugena* (Louvain, 1995), says that for Gregory of Nyssa "the knowledge obtained in this darkness is simply the knowledge that God cannot be known" (p. 254). While I am sympathetic with her overall reading of Gregory, I do not believe she appreciates sufficiently the role of πίστις in the matter of God's knowability. To know that God cannot be known is positive knowledge about God. Is this all Gregory is saying in this finding God by means of πίστις? The bride has been desiring the beloved throughout her many ascents. Can this knowing be reduced to knowledge about God? Or is there a type of knowing which encounters but does not grasp (κατάληψις), a knowing which is an unknowing? This is what knowing by means of πίστις intends. That the grasp of πίστις is not on the order of discursive knowledge but is nonetheless related to propositional, discursive knowledge, see Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, p. 63.

[54] Ibid., 182, 17.

[55] Ibid., 183, 10-12.

[56] Ibid., 12-15.

The Arrow-Tip of Faith

If the ascents of Abraham and the bride reveal πίστις as the epistemological apex of an apophatic ascent, the means by which union with God is attained, other Homilies on the Song reveal πίστις as the means by which divine indwelling comes about.

Gregory says in Homily Three that the soul "must establish in itself by faith alone (διὰ μόνης πίστεως) the nature that transcends every intelligence."[57] Immediately Gregory has the friends of the bridegroom address the soul directly, and the language of indwelling is again taken up: "through faith, you will be put under the yoke and become a dwelling place for the one who, by dwelling within you, is going to recline in you. For you will be his throne and will become his abode."[58] Paul, whom Gregory considers a symbol of πίστις,[59] then embodies this indwelling; for he has become a vessel of election and "a house containing the nature which nothing can contain."[60]

Πίστις, then, is not only a means of apophatic union, but also, as a result of this union, a vehicle of divine indwelling. This mediation by πίστις is elaborated with considerably more nuance in Homilies Four and Twelve.

Near the end of Homily Four Gregory is commenting on Sg 2, 5: "I am wounded by love."[61] He begins his interpretation of this lemma with the evocative image of the bride as target of the wounding arrow and concludes by shifting the imagery to that of nuptial union, thus conflating the two images so that we see the bride *become* this very arrow, as she herself is embraced, taken up, aimed and shot. To understand the central role of πίστις in all this, however, it is necessary to consider more closely this arrow that has penetrated the heart of the bride.

Gregory identifies the archer as love, further identified a few lines later as God (1 Jn 4, 8), and the arrow as the only-begotten Son. The archer

---

[57] *In Cant.* III, GNO VI, 87, 5-8.

[58] Ibid., 87, 14-17.

[59] *De beat.* VI, GNO VII, ii, 137, 23-24.

[60] *In Cant.* III, GNO VI, 88, 6.

[61] These are not words of despair or horror but of praise for the archer's fine marksmanship (see *In Cant.* IV, GNO VI, 127, 7-10). Dünzl, *Braut und Bräutigam*, p. 95, sees behind this image that of Eros with his bow. While the story of the birth of Eros is recounted perhaps most notably in the *Symposium*, 203b ff., the arrow is missing altogether from Plato's account; see C. Osborne, *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* (Oxford, 1994), p. 71, n. 35.

penetrates the bride's heart along with the arrow.[62] Gregory implies that the bride's exclamation is not merely praise for the archer's fine marksmanship, but actual words of boast for the wound she now bears: "Therefore, having been elevated through these divine ascents, the soul sees within herself the sweet arrow of love by which she was wounded and she boasts of this blow saying: 'I am wounded by love'."[63] The richness of the text merits considerable comment, but for our purposes it is sufficient to observe the ascent motif onto which Gregory has grafted this penetration of divine love into the heart of the bride. In light of what we have already seen of the role of πίστις in the apophatic ascents of both Abraham and the bride in Homily Six, it comes as no surprise to see the importance attributed to πίστις in this experience of divine indwelling.

Gregory describes the tip of the arrow: "The tip of the arrow is faith."[64] Hence, while the "sweet arrow of love" is the Only-begotten, the tip of the arrow is πίστις, and by means of πίστις both the arrow and the archer (God) are introduced into the heart. This is the reason for the bride's boastful oxymoron: "O beautiful wound and sweet blow"; for by means of πίστις a doorway has been opened up to allow divine life to enter and dwell within.[65]

When πίστις performed in previous texts a technical role, the sense of instrumentality was established morphologically: πίστις often appeared either as an instrumental dative or as the object of the preposition διά.[66] Although there is no question here of the instrumental dative, the force of instrumentality yet obtains by virtue of the imagery: as the pointed tip of this

---

[62] *In Cant.* IV, GNO VI, 127, 10-16.

[63] Ibid., 127, 18-128, 3.

[64] Ibid., 127, 14-15.

[65] Ibid., 128, 3-5. It is precisely this role of πίστις which constitutes the fundamental difference between Gregory and Origen on their respective interpretations of Sg 2, 5. While Origen designates the arrow as the cause of the wound and God as the archer, he does not mention the tip of the arrow, which Gregory has mentioned and further identifies as πίστις. Origen mentions the shield of πίστις which protects the soul from the darts of the evil one. But Origen's πίστις does not facilitate divine indwelling and union as does Gregory's. See Origen, *Comm. in Cant.* III, 8, GCS, pp. 195, 28 ff.; see also *Hom. in Cant.* II, SC 37 bis, 134. For a discussion of this theme of arrows, particularly in Origen, see "Arrows, *Eros. Agapē*" in C. Osborne, *Eros Unveiled*, pp. 52-85, esp. pp. 71-74.

[66] *In inscrip. Psalm.*, GNO V, 83, 1-2; *Contra Eunom.* I, 373, GNO I, 136, 17; *In Cant.* III, GNO VI, 87, 5-8 and 14-17; *In Cant.* VI, GNO VI, 183, 6-10.

arrow, πίστις mediates divine indwelling by creating a doorway by which God may enter.[67]

The mediation by πίστις of divine indwelling instead of divine union is not meant to describe yet another function of πίστις. For Gregory, divine indwelling and divine union are different aspects of the same thing. This becomes clear as he continues to comment on the lemma; for suddenly the bride is no longer the target at which the archer takes aim. Due to the presence of the divine arrow within her, she herself becomes an arrow.[68] She is embraced and held in the bow of the archer's left hand. Her body is now the shaft of the arrow held at the notched end by his right hand.

In this conflation of images,[69] God becomes both archer and bridegroom, and she both arrow and bride;[70] in all of this πίστις plays a precise role, mediating all contact between the soul and the divine.

In Homily Twelve the bride's heart is struck again by the arrow-tip of faith, but here we see yet another effect of this mediation by πίστις. The arrow-tip of πίστις mediates not only union and indwelling presence but also causes the bride's desire for the bridegroom to expand.[71] Expansion

---

[67] As instrumental as πίστις is, however, it should not be viewed in isolation from the element of grace, which Gregory suggests; for the arrow-tip of πίστις has been moistened with the spirit of life (Rom. 8, 2). This counters Völker's claim in *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, p. 141, that Gregory leaves to one side the question of grace and πίστις.

[68] *In Cant.* IV, GNO VI, 128, 5-14.

[69] Brian Daley has noted this transformation of the bride but overlooks both the conflation of images and the role of πίστις in her transformation; see B. Daley, "'Bright Darkness' and Christian Transformation" in M. Himes and S. Pope, eds., *Finding God in All Things: Essays in Honor of Michael J. Buckley. S.J.* (New York, 1996), pp. 215-230, esp. p. 225.

[70] This conflation of images is no fanciful invention on the part of Gregory. Scripture itself has facilitated this in moving from "I am wounded by love" at Sg 2, 5, to "His left hand is under my head, and his right hand shall embrace me." Hence the marital imagery of a new lemma precipitates the need to change from the archer to the bridegroom; an exegetical move that allows him to express his own theological conviction that divine indwelling, ascent and union are all different facets of the same divine encounter.

[71] *In Cant.* XII, GNO VI, 370, 6-10. Von Balthasar laments this aspect of Gregory's thought that gives dissatisfaction too important a role. See *Présence et pensée*, pp. 18-19 and p. 76. Von Balthasar is well aware that such is the logical outcome of the relationship between finite creature and infinite being (clearly set forth by Gregory in the Prologue to *In Cant.* VI). However, one has the impression that von Balthasar has too linear a view of unceasing desire. To view the matter as constant frustration is to view the search for God along too linear a line, as though Gregory were playing metaphysical

of desire, mediated by πίστις is a sign not of absence but of union with the beloved.[72]

Conclusion

For Gregory of Nyssa the soul, or bride, desires nothing but to know the divine essence,[73] but when the mind makes such an attempt it is "cut off on all sides as by a kind of darkness."[74] Does this desire to know the beloved end in frustration? Is there no means of approaching and attaining union with the beloved? Mühlenberg obviously would think not, and we shall turn presently to him, but we have seen that for Gregory of Nyssa indeed there is, and this is precisely the role which he bestows on the term πίστις. Even in as early a work as *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*, Gregory could speak of πίστις in this exalted sense as a means of apophatic approach to God. He continued to speak along these same lines as he entered the Eunomian debate; in the *Contra Eunomium* πίστις betokens *docta ignorantia*, an

---

cache-cache: the more one moves from point A to point B, the more point B recedes. Gregory's image of infinite expansion, as seen here in Homily Twelve and underlying his doctrine on ἐπέκτασις in general precludes such a linear view. Unceasing desire and divine union are two aspects of a single encounter. See C. Desalvo, *L'"oltre" nel presente*, p. 242, n. 36.

[72] It is indeed tempting to suggest, as R. Heine has done, that Gregory's doctrine on *epektasis* is a counterpoint to Origen's κόρος. See R. Heine, *Perfection in the Virtuous Life: A Study in the Relationship between Edification and Polemical Theology in Gregory of Nyssa* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 5-10 and pp. 76 ff. See also E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Göttingen, 1965), p. 27. One must, however, proceed with caution; Simonetti (*Vita de Mosè*, p. xx and esp. pp. xxx-xxxvi, has criticized Heine on this very point, noting that Origen himself would seem to anticipate the theme of ἐπέκτασις in *Hom. Num.* 17, 4, GCS, 7, 160, 11-26. Moreover, Simonetti says: "per formulare la dottrina del progresso senza fine non è indispensabile ammettere l'infinità di Dio: infatti anche Origene, che non l'ammette, però la sua abissale trascendenza respetto alla finitezza del uomo, e su tale base può proporre anche lui quella dottrina (p. xxxvi)." Finally Simonetti claims that even the inclination to overcome κόρος with ἐπέκτασις comes from Origen. See also B. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook on Patristic Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 50. For a discussion of important convergences and divergences between Origen and Gregory see A. Meredith, "Origen's *De Principiis* and Gregory of Nyssa's *Oratio Catechetica*," *Heythrop Journal* 36 (1995) 1-14 and idem. *The Cappadocians* (London, 1995), pp. 54-62.

[73] *In Cant.* VI, GNO VI, 181, 16-19.

[74] See *In Eccl.*, SC, VII, 8, 100-104; *De beat.* VI, GNO VII, ii, 137, 16-22; *De vita Moysis* SC, II, 163, 8.

unknowing higher than knowledge, that has abandoned all concepts and images in the face of the Incomprehensible. In Gregory's interpretation of the migration of Abraham, the problem of attaining to and uniting with the unknowable God is resolved in πίστις. This exalted notion of πίστις continues into his mature years as we saw in the *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum*, where the grasp of faith mediates union with God, divine indwelling and expanding desire for the bridegroom.[75]

Spanning the length of his career, these examples of exalted πίστις lead us to counter Völker's claim that Gregory accords the term no technical meaning. This article, by contrast, has argued that, although the term can be used quite widely, there are consistent contexts in which πίστις stands out from its wide range of other meanings and takes on an exalted, technical meaning.[76] When used in apophatic contexts, whether or not there be an explicitly epistemological ascent in which πίστις is always the summit, such as we saw in the migration of Abraham or in the case of the bride in Homily Six on the Song of Songs, πίστις takes on a technical meaning: it designates the means by which the soul attains to divine union. Such union, as we have seen, yields consistent results: πίστις renders the soul a dwelling place for God; πίστις expands the soul's desire for God even as the soul delights in God; πίστις does what διάνοια could never do: grasp the incomprehensible nature of God; πίστις nevertheless passes on to διάνοια something of what it has grasped of the Ungraspable. These are the principle functions of πίστις when seen in its technical role as faculty of apophatic union.

In these apophatic contexts, moreover, this technical meaning, is often (but not always) rendered by a particular grammatical morphology. The mediational sense which technical, exalted πίστις serves is often expressed conveniently either as an instrumental dative or as the object of the prepo-

---

[75] Consideration for length has prevented us from examining other texts, such as *De vita Moysis*, but exalted πίστις is never the less present here as well; for in the Holy of Holies and especially in the "darkness where God dwells", darkness introduces to the mind (διάνοια) a sense of separation, but for πίστις this apophatic darkness is presence and union. See *De vita Moysis*, SC, I, 46, 2-10; II, 188, 8-10; II, 135, 10.

[76] This article has identified the following examples of exalted πίστις: *In inscrip. Psalm.*, GNO V, 82, 25-83, 2; *Contra Eunom.* I, 371, GNO I, 136, 17; *Contra Eunom.* II, 91, GNO I, 253, 25-28; *In Cant.* III, GNO VI, 87, 5-8; *In Cant.* III, 87, 14-17; *In Cant.* IV, 128, 3-5; *In Cant.* VI, 183, 6-10; *In Cant.* XII, 370, 6-10. Other examples include: *Vita Greg. Thaum.*, GNO X, i, 10, 5-7; *De Vita Moysis*, SC, I, 46, 2-10; II, 188, 8-10; II, 315, 10.

sition διά (διὰ [μόνης] τῆς πίστεως). The identification of this reserved use of πίστις allows us to see just how important the notion of union is for Gregory and, therefore, invites some comment regarding the well-known thesis of Mühlenberg.

Despite the fact that Gregory states explicitly at the outset of the *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum* that union with God is the purpose of the Song,[77] Mühlenberg would deny that Gregory allows for the possibility of union with God.[78] On the basis of our examination of the role which exalted πίστις has played in any number of texts, we have seen time and again that union with God is one of the primary concerns of exalted πίστις. Perhaps the reason why Mühlenberg does not allow for divine union is quite simply as Dünzl stated it: Mühlenberg gives πίστις no consideration.[79]

Mühlenberg would argue that union with God implied a γνῶσις tantamount to enclosing God in the grasp of comprehension. We have seen, however, that this is precisely what the grasp of πίστις obviates. For it is not knowledge of a conceptual order but rather an unknowing which is higher than the conceptual grasp of διάνοια. This union διὰ μόνης τῆς πίστεως, moreover, safeguards the distinction between finite creature and infinite Creator, for it is a union beyond knowledge. A strict boundary between finite creature and infinite Creator risks preventing any access to the Infinite without the loss of ontological status as a creature. Had Mühlenberg considered this technical function played by πίστις, he might have seen how πίστις resolved this dilemma. While Gregory consistently maintains that the divine nature cannot be grasped by the mind (διάνοια), and the boundary is never blurred, he does, never the less, know the "language of grasping."[80] It is "the grasp of faith"[81] that allows for union between finite and Infinite without compromising their distinction. Gregorian

---

[77] *In Cant.* I, GNO VI, 15, 13-15: διὰ γὰρ τῶν ἐνταῦθα γεγραμμένων νυμφοστολεῖται τρόπον τινὰ ἡ ψυχὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀσώματόν τε καὶ πνευματικὴν καὶ ἀμόλυντον τοῦ θεοῦ συζυγίαν.

[78] Kannengieser issued long ago a caveat in this regard; see his "L'Infinité divine chez Grégoire de Nysse," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 55 (1967) 55-65 at 64; see also B. Pottier, *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse*, pp. 217-217.

[79] *Braut und Bräutigam*, p. 326, n. 19: "Die Sonderstellung der πίστις und ihre Bedeutung für die Einwohnung Gottes im Menschen hier [sc. Hom. III] und in Hom. VI (s.o. S. 295-298) findet bei Mühlenberg keine Beachtung." See also C. Desalvo, *L'"oltre" nel presente*, p. 221.

[80] M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, p. 62.

[81] *In Cant.* VI, GNO VI, 183, 9.

πίστις, therefore, serves closely related epistemological functions which Mühlenberg has not taken into account.

E.R. Dodds noted many years ago: "To any one brought up on classical Greek philosophy, πίστις meant the lowest grade of cognition: it was the state of mind of the uneducated, who believe things on hearsay without being able to give reasons for their belief."[82] Eusebius tells us that Galen and Celsus accused Christians of promoting an unreasoning faith.[83] Indeed this objection to Christian fideism by non-Christian philosophers such as Galen, Celsus, Porphyry and Julian has been well documented in recent years.[84] It is precisely in this cultural context of general hellenistic derision of πίστις, that Gregory's technical use of the term can best be understood.[85]

In the various texts in which we saw πίστις in this reserved sense, Paul was hovering in the background. Heb. 11, 8 f.; II Cor. 5, 7; and Rom. 4, 3 played an important role in establishing this exalted meaning. This perhaps more than anything gives us a clue as to what Gregory is doing in designating πίστις as a faculty of apophatic union. In a philosophical culture which characteristically viewed with great suspicion the capacity of πίστις to be of any serious consequence in approaching God, Gregory of Nyssa rehabilitates πίστις for the benefit of hellenized Christians along these very lines. By drawing out the epistemological implications of Pauline πίστις Gregory attributes to πίστις qualities which the generally neoplatonic cul-

---

[82] E.R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*, (Cambridge, 1965), p. 121. See also R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London, 1972), p. 105.

[83] *Praep. evang.*, SC, I, 1, 11, 4-5; I, 2, 4, 2-3; I, 3, 1, 5-6.

[84] See for example, R. Walzer, *Galen on Christians and Jews* (Oxford, 1955), esp. pp. 65-74; J. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 231-246; S. Benko, "Pagan Criticism of Christianity during the First Two Centuries" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Vol. 23, II, W. Haase, ed. (Berlin, 1980), pp. 1053-1118; A. Meredith, "Porphyry and Julian against the Christians" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Vol. 23, I, W. Haase, ed. (Berlin, 1980), pp. 1119-1149; R. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven, 1984).

[85] The fact that later neoplatonism exalted πίστις in a manner not entirely dissimilar to Gregory can only be alluded to here. Even so devoted a critic as Porphyry did not disavow all recourse to πίστις; see *Ad Marcel.*, 24. For more examples of later neoplatonism's exaltation of πίστις over γνῶσις for approaching the One-Good see, for example, Proclus, *Theol. platon.* I, 25 (Saffrey and Westerink, p. 112), idem, *Commentary on Alcibiades I*, trans. W. O'Neill (The Hague, 1965), p. 33, n. 106; Iamblichus, *De myst.* I, 3, 8, 3-4 (Des Places, p. 42); Simplicius, *In Aristotelis de Coelo Commentaria*, 55, ed. J. Heiberg (Berlin, 1894). No direct Christian influence on later neoplatonists is implied,

tural milieu reserved to the furthest reaches of νοῦς: union with the Incomprehensible. Indeed if one were pressed to identify (a task which cannot be pursued here) Gregory's sources for his exalted notion of πίστις in this technical sense we have described, one would be inclined to name neither Plato, nor Plotinus—nor Origen nor Philo for that matter—but Paul himself, for "we walk by faith and not by sight" (II Cor. 5, 7).

Villanova University, *Villanova*, PA 19085
Dept. of Theology, 800 Lancester Avenue

---

apropos of which see the chain of discussion by L. Rosán, *The Philosophy of Proclus* (New York, 1949), p. 215, n. 152; A. Armstrong, "Platonic *Eros* and Christian *Agape*," *Downside Review* (1961) 116, n. 15; Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*, p. 123; and J. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality*, p. 245.

APULEIUS, PUDENTILLA, AND CHRISTIANITY

BY

VINCENT HUNINK

In 1968 P.G. Walsh for the first time suggested that Apuleius' novel *Metamorphoses* (*Met.*) was composed in response to contemporaneous Christianity, an idea he has recently repeated: 'this fervid recommendation of the religion of Isis may represent a counterblast to the meteoric spread of Christianity in Africa in the later second century'.[1] Whereas Walsh himself has not added further evidence to support his theory, an elaborate defence of it was lately undertaken by V. Schmidt.[2] By closely examining the crucial passage 9,14 in the *Met.*,[3] Schmidt showed that characters in Apuleius' novel use terminology current in religious confrontations between Christians and pagans, which seems an indication that the novel was actually also intended as a reaction to Christianity.

Schmidt wisely warns us at the end of his article that, given the complex narratological situation in the novel, we should not regard the Isis religion of the *Met.* as an ideological *alternative* that was fully endorsed by Apuleius himself. Two points, I would suggest, now seem established beyond reasonable doubt: not only was Apuleius aware of the existence of Christianity, but he did not feel much sympathy for it either. Neither point, however, is immediately clear from Apuleius' extant writings, since they contain no mention of the new religion.

We can now extend the scope to Apuleius' minor works.[4] It may be

---

[1] P.G. Walsh, Lucius Madaurensis, *Phoenix* 12 (1968) 151-153. Apuleius, *The golden ass, translated with introduction and explanatory notes by P.G. Walsh* (Oxford 1994) xxxvii-xxxviii.

[2] Victor Schmidt, Reaktionen auf das Christentum in den Metamorphosen des Apuleius, *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997) 51-71.

[3] In another recent study, this passage on the miller's woman is interpreted without further discussion as being anti-Christian. See: Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Early Christian women and pagan opinion. The power of the hysterical woman* (Cambridge 1996) 67-73. This interpretation is, indeed, probable, but not an established fact, as MacDonald seems to present it. For further discussion and literature see Schmidt (above, note 2).

[4] For clarity's sake I have called them 'minor works'. But this epithet should be taken

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

worthwhile to examine whether there are any further anti-Christian traces in his philosophical treatises and speeches. This is what I propose to do in this article, intended as a sequel to Schmidt's study.

Philosophy

Starting with the philosophical writings, we are immediately confronted with great problems. First, there is no scholarly agreement on the authenticity of works attributed to Apuleius; and second, their relative chronology remains uncertain, although most scholars would now agree in postulating dates earlier than the *Met.* For the purpose of the present inquiry, however, we may leave these matters undecided and just examine the relevant texts.[5]

They provide little or nothing which seems to come anywhere near the invective of the *Met.* Nowhere in the bookish treatise *De dogmate Platonis* on the life and teachings of Plato, nor in the scientific works on cosmology and logic, *De mundo* and *De interpretatione*, do we find any reference to Christianity, either directly or indirectly.

This may be explained by their possibly early dates of composition, but above all by their genre and special nature. Although literary embellishments are not completely missing, all three works serve a rather modest aim, compared to the rest: they explain and summarize Greek philosophical theory from the classical age, focusing on Plato and Aristotle. Indeed, *De Mundo* and *De interpretatione* are Latin translations from Greek originals which may date back to a much earlier period, when Christianity was still in its infancy or did not even exist.[6]

Similar remarks apply to the Hermetic *Asclepius*, but here the Greek original dates from a much later, Christian period.[7] At least some elements

---

to refer only to their length and their importance in scholarship, not to their intrinsic interest.

[5] For a brief survey of the problems see: Apuleius of Madauros, *Pro se de magia (Apologia)*, edited with a commentary by Vincent Hunink (Amsterdam 1997) vol. 1, 20-22.

[6] On Apuleius' translation technique in *De Mundo*, see e.g. A. Marchetta, Apuleio traduttore, in: *La langue Latine, langue de la philosophie*, actes du colloque organisé par l'École Française de Rome 1 (Roma 1992) 203-218.

[7] For bibliography on the Latin *Asclepius*, traditionally attributed to Apuleius but generally declared spurious, see: Vincent Hunink, Apuleius and the 'Asclepius', *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996) 288-308. In this contribution I attempted to reopen the debate on the authenticity of the work and adduced arguments in favour of Apuleian authorship.

in it have been interpreted as a rejection of Christianity. The most important passage is *Ascl.* 24-26, an apocalyptic complaint on the decline of Egypt: for instance, it is prophesied that the land will be full of tombs and corpses instead of temples and gods, that people will prefer shadows to light and despise all doctrines about the soul, and that the gods will withdraw from mankind. Such elements easily lend themselves to an anti-Christian interpretation; already Augustine took the entire section as a prediction by 'Hermes' of the final defeat of pagan religion (cf. Augustine *C.D.* 8, 23).[8] However, these references can be explained from the Egyptian Hermetic tradition, and on the whole they are so vague and ambivalent as to be unconvincing. In his recent Dutch translation of the *Asclepius*, G. Quispel plainly states that there is nothing in the treatise that would suggest real knowledge of Christian teaching.[9]

Flowering paganism

In the *Florida*, a collection of 23 extracts of speeches by Apuleius, and in the philosophical discourse *De Deo Socratis*[10] we also find no manifest allusions to Christianity in particular, but there is a decidedly pagan sensibility pervading these pieces. The opening section of the *Florida* presents a warmly religious picture, which is worth quoting in full:

> Vt ferme religiosis uiantium moris est, cum aliqui lucus aut aliqui locus sanctus in uia oblatus est, uotum postulare, pomum adponere, paulisper adsidere: ita mihi ingresso sanctissimam istam ciuitatem, quanquam oppido festinem, praefanda uenia et habenda oratio et inhibenda properatio est.
> Neque enim iustius religiosam moram uiatori obiecerit aut ara floribus redimita aut spelunca frondibus inumbrata aut quercus cornibus onerata aut fagus pellibus coronata, uel enim colliculus sepimine consecratus uel truncus dolamine effigiatus uel cespes libamine umigatus uel lapis unguine delibutus. Parua haec

[8] For further references see: Brian P. Copenhaver, *Hermetica, The Greek corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius, in a new English translation with notes and introduction* (Cambridge 1992) esp. 241-242; Copenhaver seems to leave open the possibility of anti-Christian sentiments in the text.

[9] *Asclepius, de volkomen openbaring van Hermes Trismegistus, ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht door G. Quispel* (Amsterdam 1996) 282.

[10] On the nature of the *Florida* and its possible origins, see B.L. Hijmans jr., Apuleius orator: "Pro se de Magia" and "Florida", *ANRW* 2, 34, 2 (1994) 1708-1784, esp. 1719-1724. Much material on *De Deo Socratis* can be found in: Lucius Apuleius von Madaura, *De Deo Socratis, der Schutzgeist des Sokrates*, übersetzt, eingeleitet und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Michael Bingenheimer (Frankfurt am Main 1993).

> quippe et quanquam paucis percontantibus adorata, tamen ignorantibus transcursa.
>
> It is a common custom with religious travellers, when they come upon some grove or sacred place, to beseech favour, offer up prayers, and sit down a while; in like manner, now that I have entered this most hallowed city, though I am in great haste, I must entreat favour, make oration, and check my hurry. For the traveller can find no fitter motives for a religious pause in an altar decked with flowers, or a dell shaded with foliage, or an oak loaded with horns, or a beech festooned with skins, or even a consecrated and enclosed hillock, or a trunk chiselled into the form of an image, or a turf redolent of libation, or a stone bedewed with ointment. These are small things indeed, and though adored by the few who scrutinise them, are passed unnoticed by those who are not aware of them.[11]

The general atmosphere is clearly religious from the start. We know nothing for sure about the context of the fragment, but the speaker is obviously addressing an audience while entering an important town, possibly Oea.[12] Here, he says, he must pause and deliver a speech; this is presented as an almost sacred task, which is literally compared to the religious duty inspired by typical elements of pagan religion.

Apuleius specifies no less than eight of them, in a piece of exquisite writing. All elements show the same syntactical pattern and word order: a noun followed by a participle with an adjunct in the ablative (*ara floribus redimita*). The words seem carefully chosen to impress the audience by their very sound; for example, the first four elements have female endings (*redimita, inumbrata, onerata, coronata*), whereas the second group of four has male endings (*consecratus, effigiatus, umigatus, delibutus*). The ensuing 'homoeoptoton'

---

[11] *Fl.* 1. Translation: [Anonymous] *The Works of Apuleius*, (George Bell and Sons) (London/New York 1893) 374. Translations of the *Florida* in English are scarce; the latest one being that by of H.E. Butler, *The Apologia and Florida of Apuleius of Madaura* (Oxford 1909) (repr. Westport, Connecticut 1970). A new English translation of *Apology*, *Florida* and *De Deo Socratis* is currently being prepared by a team led by Dr. Stephen Harrison.

[12] One might think of Carthago, since this city is mentioned or celebrated at several places in the *Florida*: 9; 16; 17; 18; 20. On the other hand, the speaker says he is in a hurry and he seems to be just passing by, heading for another destination. This would rather suggest some provincial town as the place of *Fl.* 1. Oea seems a good candidate: in *Apol.* 72 Apuleius tells of a journey to Alexandria, during which he had to stop at Oea (here he met the woman who was to become his wife, Pudentilla). In addition, the religious imagery of *Fl.* 1 may well have found special favour in Oea: from *Apol.* 55,10-11 we know Apuleius once delivered a speech there about Asclepius, which was favourably received by the inhabitants of Oea, explicitly called *religiosi*.

creates a deliberate jingle, while further complex sound patterns are produced by additional internal correspondence in rhythm, number of syllables, and sound (e.g. *sepimine, dolamine, libamine, unguine*).[13]

The speaker clearly delights in elaborating such religious details, which are not strictly necessary for his argument. They are presented largely for their own sake, and consciously celebrate concrete expressions of Roman religion. The repeated word *religiosus* drives home the point.

This 'pagan miniature' can be confronted with a passage in the Christian apologist Minucius Felix, probably also an African by birth. At the beginning of his *Octavius*, he pictures himself walking on the shore near Ostia, accompanied by his friend Caecilius and the Christian Octavius. On passing a statue of Serapis, Caecilius makes a devout gesture: he brings his hand to his lips. For this common expression of reverence he is then indirectly criticized by Octavius. The Christian admonishes Minucius:

> Non boni uiri est, Marce frater, hominem domi forisque lateri tuo inhaerentem sic in hac inperitiae uulgaris caecitate deserere, ut tam luculento die in lapides eum pateris inpingere, effigiatos sane et unctos et coronatos, cum scias huius erroris non minorem ad te quam ad ipsum infamiam redundare.
>
> With a friend who indoors and out clings to your side, no good man, brother Marcus, has the right to leave him in the thick darkness of vulgar ignorance, and allow him in broad daylight to wreck himself on stones, however carved and anointed and garlanded they may be, when you know that the shame of his error redounds no less to your discredit than to his.[14]

This incident then leads to the discussion which takes up the rest of the work.

Interestingly, there is a close parallel to Apuleius' text.[15] We may compare the words *lapides . . . effigiatos . . . et unctos et coronatos*, with Apuleius' *truncus dolamine effigiatus, lapides unguine delibutus*, and *fagus pellibus coronata*. In another Apuleian passage (*Apology* 56,6), to which we will return shortly,

---

[13] To these few examples of the stylistic bravura in *Fl.* 1 many others might be added. Cf. e.g. Mariateresa Scotti, Religiosis viantium: nota ad Apuleio, Florida 1, in: N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus, studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday* (London 1988) 126-7. The 'flowery' style which is evident in this piece may well explain the title *Florida*.

[14] Min.Fel. 3,1. The translation by Gerald H. Rendall is quoted from: Tertullian, *Apology; De spectaculis*; Minucius Felix, Loeb Classical Library nr. 250, pp. 317-319.

[15] Jean Beaujeu, who is well known for his Apuleian studies and editions, briefly noticed the parallel in his 1964 Budé edition of Minucius Felix (p. 73), and suggested Minucius may echo the Apuleian passage; more possible echoes are listed on page xxxiv.

Apuleius refers to the religious elements *lapidem unctum aut ramum coronatum.*

The custom of anointing stones was considered typical of pagan religion, or in the Christian view, *idolatria.*[16] We also see it in Lucian's satirical work on the false prophet Alexander:

> If he but saw anywhere a stone smeared with holy oil or adorned with a wreath, he would fall on his face forthwith, kiss his hand, and stand beside it for a long time making vows and craving blessings from it.[17]

This, it may be added, should not be read as a thorough criticism of the custom as such; Lucian merely puts scorn on Alexander who pretends piety and exaggerates his gestures.

Given these parallels, what is so striking about the Apuleian passage is not that it refers to the custom, but that it actually *celebrates* it. It seems to defy any possible criticism and proudly brings pagan piety to the foreground. Admittedly, Minucius Felix is dated later than Apuleius, at around 195 AD,[18] but the distance in years is not immense, since the pieces in the *Florida* must be dated to 160-170 AD. It is not impossible, I would suggest, that Apuleius is partly writing in response to Christian attacks on Roman religion.

Demons

Support for this suggestion may be found in other parts of the *Florida.* In *Fl.* 10 we are presented with a whole range of divine powers connected to celestial bodies: Sol and Luna, Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, Saturn, and Mars. There are also *mediae deum potestates*, the speaker continues, like Amor and other invisible spirits.

Here we see how Apuleius touches on what appears to be one of his primary interests, the various classes of *demons.* This originally Platonic concept is mentioned several times in his works,[19] and is even the basic theme

---

[16] Cf. e.g. Arnob. *Adv.nat.* 1,39 and Aug. *C.D.* 16,38.

[17] Lucian, *Alexander* 30. The translation by A.M. Harmon is quoted from: Lucian, volume IV, Loeb Classical Library nr. 162, p. 317.

[18] There is some doubt about the date of the *Octavius*, but it must have been written after 160. If it is later than Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, as many scholars would now argue, it must be dated *after* 197; see Michael Von Albrecht, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (München 1994) 1231-1232.

[19] Apuleius' demonology has been given comparatively much attention by scholars. Two recent contributions are: Wolfgang Bernard, Zur Dämonologie des Apuleius von

of the discourse *De Deo Socratis*, which mentions many more gods (1-3), and defines and groups the various demons (7-18). Not all these 'demons' are frightening, but many of them are salutary and helpful and must hence be honoured and cultivated, like Socrates did with his private *daimon*.

It is hardly surprising that Christians fiercely combatted this Platonic demonology. The most famous example is Augustine's extensive discussion on Apuleius' discourse in *C.D.* 8,[20] but there is evidence of much earlier discussion. Already Tertullian, writing only one generation after Apuleius in Africa, can be seen refuting pagan ideas on demons.[21] So here again, it would seem probable that Apuleius' conscious treatment of the theme reflects contemporaneous discussions, which are likely to have gained new relevance by the surge of Christianity.[22]

It is possible to interpret other elements in the *Florida* along these lines, but this would lead us into the field of speculation. What does emerge from a reading of *Florida* and *De Deo Socratis*, is an overall picture of profoundly pagan sympathies. Given the notion that Apuleius must have been aware of Christianity and disliked it, would it not be natural to call this a *consciously non-Christian* attitude?

Execution

Proud, pagan religiosity may also be found in the last work of Apuleius which I will now consider, his defensive speech *Apology* (Pro Se De Magia).

The chronology of Apuleius' works may involve many problems, but the *Apology* can at least be dated with a fair degree of certainty. The mention of Claudius Maximus, the judge presiding over the trial, allows us to fix the year at 158/159 AD. So the *Apology* is earlier than the *Florida*, and probably much earlier than the *Met.*,[23] and one may raise the question

---

Madaura, *RhM* 137 (1994) 358-373, and Hans Münstermann, *Apuleius: Metamorphosen literarischer Vorlagen. Untersuchung dreier Episoden des Romans unter Berücksichtigung der Philosophie und Theologie des Apuleius* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1995) 175-185.

[20] On this polemic, see e.g. C. Moreschini, La polemica di Agostino contro la demonologia di Apuleio, *ASNP* 3, 2 (1972) 583-96.

[21] E.g. Tert. *Apol.* 22 ff.; cf. also Min.Fel. 26-28.

[22] Interestingly, *De Deo Socratis* ends with an elaborate eulogy on Socrates (21-23), whom we are invited to follow as a model in caring for one's demon. A similar exhortation to follow Socrates can be found in the defence of paganism by Caecilius in Min.Fel. 13. But the parallel is not exact, and Socrates is, after all, a fairly natural and common example in general.

[23] Cf. also Schmidt (above, note 2), 64.

whether traces of Christianity or anti-Christian attitudes are likely to be found here at all.

Although the rapid growth of Christianity in Africa must be dated somewhat later than 158, it did not occur unexpectedly and the new religion must have started spreading earlier. Moreover, Apuleius may well have experienced it during his stays abroad. We know he travelled and studied at least in Athens, Samos, Phrygia, and Rome,[24] that is, in places where Christianity was visible and posed problems to intellectuals and authorities at a much earlier date than in Africa.

Apuleius was a provincial intellectual of broad interests, a man eager to pursue his studies in the centres of the ancient world, a disciple willing to learn the wisdom of Greek and Roman culture, to master both Greek and Latin (neither being his native tongue), and a man with profound religious and occult interests, as he indicates himself in the speech:

> Sacrorum pleraque initia in Graecia participaui. Eorum quaedam signa et monumenta tradita mihi a sacerdotibus sedulo conseruo. Nihil insolitum, nihil incognitum dico. Vel unius Liberi patris mystae qui adestis, scitis quid domi conditum celetis et absque omnibus profanis tacite ueneremini. At ego, ut dixi, multiiuga sacra et plurimos ritus et uarias cerimonias studio ueri et officio erga deos didici.
>
> I participated in several sacred rites in Greece. I keep certain tokens and objects of these rites which the priests gave to me. I claim nothing unusual, nothing unknown. Even you, initiates of the one father Liber, who are here know what you keep hidden at home and honor silently, away from all non-initiates. Certainly I, as I was saying, have learned manifold rituals, numerous rites, and various ceremonies out of an eagerness for truth and service to the gods.[25]

---

[24] Several other cities and regions are sometimes mentioned by scholars in this context, such as Alexandria, Corinth, and Thessaly, but of these we cannot be sure. Names mentioned in the *Met.*, a fictional tale, cannot simply be interpreted as representative of Apuleius' own biography. For Apuleius' stay in Rome *Met.* 11 is also often adduced. Here it is told how Lucius, after his retransformation from ass to man, worked as a lawyer in Rome to earn money for his expensive initiations into the religion of Isis. Again, it is methodically dangerous to take this as biographical fact. However, the fact that Apuleius actually was in Rome is proved by his statement in *Florida* 17,4, where he claims to have cultivated the *bonae artes* both in Africa and 'with friends in Rome.' (*. . . eamque existimationem morum ac studiorum cum in prouincia nostra tum etiam Romae penes amicos tuos quaesisse me tute ipse locupletissimus testis es*).

[25] *Apol.* 55, 8-9. The translation is quoted (with two small changes) from a draft translation prepared in the course of a 1996 seminar led by Prof. James O'Donnell at the University of Pennsylvania. The text was made available on the Internet.

Surely, in Rome too Apuleius must have been studying, attending teachers, looking for new philosophical and religious ideas, and participating in discussions. Given the intellectual climate in Rome at around 150 AD, it is quite inconceivable that he would *not* have come across Christians. Schmidt (above, note 2; p. 60) already pointed out that in Rome Apuleius is likely to have met his fellow African Fronto, a generation older than himself and a famous author, who is known to have openly fought Christianity at this early stage, in a speech against the Christian eucharist.[26]

There is a small, but significant detail in the *Apology* that also points in this direction. At the beginning (2,11), Apuleius mentions the city prefect of Rome, Lollius Urbicus, who in an earlier case passed sentence on Apuleius' opponent Aemilianus, and had nearly put him to death. This Lollius Urbicus, who may have been present at Apuleius' trial (the text of 3,1 is unclear here), and who is referred to with great respect by Apuleius, is best known from a rather different source, a famous Christian text written in Rome at the time. In Justin's *Second Apology*, the author, faced with increasing public outcries against Christians and the threat of persecution, sharply protests against the execution of three Christians. These executions, which took place at about 152 AD, had been ordered by this same Lollius Urbicus who is so kindly addressed by Apuleius in 158.[27] It is more than likely that the two met in Rome, and so, inevitably, Apuleius must have been well aware of the whole affair. Nonetheless, Apuleius remains entirely silent, both on this affair and on Christianity as such.

Impious and uncivilized behaviour

What should we infer from this? If we discard the untenable idea that Apuleius had Christian sympathies himself, a wild theory advanced some decades ago by L. Herrmann,[28] there remains only one possibility: that

---

[26] Cf. Min.Fel. 9,6-7.

[27] This parallel has remained unnoticed for a long time. In fact, it was only first noticed by Barry Baldwin, Apuleius and the Christians, *LCM* 14 (1989) 55. Schmidt (above, note 2) does mention this article and Justin's text in his notes (5, 33, 35) but fails to refer to the occurrence of Lollius Urbicus in Apuleius' *Apology*.

[28] Léon Herrmann, Le procès d'Apulée fut-il un procès de christianisme?, *Revue de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles* 4 (1952) 339-350; Idem, Le dieu-roi d'Apulée, *Latomus* 18 (1959) 110-116. This theory was rejected with good arguments by Raoul Mortley, Apuleius and Platonic theology, *American Journal of Philology* 93 (1972) 584-590 and Marcel Simon, Apulée et le christianisme, *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974) 299-305.

already by this early date Apuleius felt unsympathetic towards Christians.

Throughout the speech, Apuleius poses as a champion of pagan culture and religion, a devout devotee of the gods, and a pious worshipper who even keeps cult objects and worships them in private (e.g. *Apol.* 53-56 and 61-65).

What a difference, so he suggests, with his opponent Aemilianus! Shortly after his religious self-portrait quoted above, we learn more about the private life of the accuser:

> Atque ego scio nonnullos et cum primis Aemilianum istum facetiae sibi habere res diuinas deridere. Nam, ut audio partim Oeensium qui istum nouere, nulli deo ad hoc aeui supplicauit, nullum templum frequentauit, si fanum aliquod praetereat, nefas habet adorandi gratia manum labris admouere. Iste uero nec dis rurationis, qui eum pascunt ac uestiunt, segetis ullas aut uitis aut gregis primitias impertit. Nullum in uilla eius delubrum situm, nullus locus aut lucus consecratus. Ecquid ego de luco et delubro loquor? Negant uidisse se qui fuere unum saltem in finibus eius aut lapidem unctum aut ramum coronatum. Igitur adgnomenta ei duo indita: Charon, ut iam dixi, ob oris et animi diritatem, sed alterum, quod libentius audit, ob deorum contemptum, Mezentius.
>
> Still I know some people, and prominent among them that Aemilianus, who think they are witty when they make fun of religion. For, as I hear from some people in Oea who know him, he has never up to this point in his life offered a prayer to any god, he hasn't visited any temple, and if he should happen to pass some consecrated place, he thinks it's a crime to bring his hand to his lips out of reverence. In addition, the man has never shared any of the first harvest or the pick of the vine or flock with the gods of the countryside who nourish and clothe him, there is no cleansing shrine in his villa, no sacred grove or place. Why should I speak of sacred groves and shrines? Those who have been on his property say they haven't seen a single anointed stone or wreathed bough there. So he has been given two nicknames: Charon, as I already mentioned, on account of the frightfulness of his face and his soul, and the other, which he acknowledges readily on account of his contempt for the gods, is Mezentius.[29]

This is, as a whole, a devastating picture. In an attempt to disparage his accuser, Apuleius delivers a fullblown attack *ad hominem*. As such, invective techniques were quite common and accepted in Roman courts. But here the picture contains remarkable details. Aemilianus is not just generally labeled as impious and godless, he is a real enemy and *opponent* of Roman religion, carefully avoiding temples and having no sacred spots at home.

---

[29] *Apol.* 56, 3-7. Translation as in the earlier quotation from the *Apology* (again with small changes).

Worse, he does not bring any sacrifices to the gods, he refuses to make the reverent gesture of kissing one's hand in passing a sacred place, he does not possess a *lapidem unctum aut ramum coronatum*, he despises the gods, and feels proud of being called Mezentius, the Vergilian archetype of one who scorns and denies the Roman gods.[30]

But anyone pushing his resistance to Roman religion so far could easily be taken for a Christian. The details seem carefully selected to make exactly this impression: in Minucius Felix' dialogue we already met with the typically pagan elements of reverently kissing the hand and worshipping anointed stones and wreaths. In this earlier Apuleian text, we see these elements combined with signs of an active refusal to conform to the Roman religious customs. A Roman who felt insensitive to religion would be pictured as indifferent or negligent at worst; but such behaviour as Aemilianus is credited with, especially where sacrifice and worship is concerned, is typical for early Christians.

The suggestion, first raised by Emanuele Griset,[31] that in Apuleius' counter-attack Aemilianus is subtly pictured as a Christian, received a rather lukewarm reception by scholars,[32] much like Walsh's idea on the *Met.* But given all the evidence gathered so far, much is to be said for it.

Other elements from Apuleius' torrent of abuse and invective now fall into place. For instance, he consistently describes Aemilianus as one who attacks only indirectly, secretively, lurking and hiding in the dark, whereas he himself stands out in the light for all to see. Aemilianus, he says, is in fact invisible, hiding in his humble state and fleeing the light (*humilitate abdita et lucifuga*, 16,13). Now the rare *lucifugus* can be an epithet of insects (e.g. Verg. *G.* 4,243) or a term of abuse for people, but is it merely a coincidence that the word returns in anti-Christian polemics? In Minucius Felix we see the Christians described by Caecilius as persons who secretly gather during night-time, a *latebrosa et lucifuga natio* (8,4),[33] despising temples and

---

[30] Cf. e.g. G. Thome, *Vorstellungen vom Bösen in der lateinischen Literatur. Begriffe, Motive, Gestalten* (Stuttgart 1993) 455-456. On 'atheist' as a keyword in polemics between pagans and Christians, see ample material adduced by Schmidt (above, note 2; pp. 56-58).

[31] Emanuele Griset, Un christiano di Sabratha, *RSC* 5 (1957) 35-39.

[32] One of the few exceptions is: Stephen Benko, *Pagan Rome and the early Christians* (London 1985) 105, who suggests the same, apparently not knowing Griset's article. Schmidt restricts himself to mentioning Benko's suggestion in his note 1.

[33] The word *lucifugus* was to retain this special nuance even much later. See a comment on the island of Capraria from the 5th century: Rut.Nam. *De reditu suo* 440 *squalet lucifugis insula plena viris*. See the commentary of Doblhofer a.l.

gods and laughing at ceremonies. Aemilianus is also incessantly mocked and insulted for being poor, illiterate, lacking all culture and refinement, and being a proper rustic. Such insults were also hurled at Christians.

Jesus and Moses

One other passage of the *Apology* may be briefly mentioned here. In 90,6 Apuleius daringly and even provokingly gives a list of magicians, in response to the claim of magic. If the opponents can point to anything relevant at all, so he bluffs,

> ego ille sim Carmendas uel Damigeron uel † his † Moses uel Iohannes uel Apollobex uel ipse Dardanus uel quicumque alius post Zoroastren et Hostanen inter magos celebratus est.
>
> I'd be a Carmendas or a Damigeron or . . . Moses or John or Apollobex or Dardanus himself or whatever other celebrated magicians there were after Zoroaster and Hostanes.[34]

Now ". . ." corresponds to the Latin reading *his*. This is often emended to *is*, *hic*, or *iste* ('this' or 'that'), but alternatively, another name may have been lost here. The most intriguing reconstruction is *uel Iesus <uel> Moses*, based on a conjecture of Bosscha. The name of Jesus could originally have been written as *Hisus* or in its abbreviated form as *IHS*. Without doubt, among non-Christians Jesus, like Moses, had the reputation of a magician.[35] A combination of Jesus and Moses, two Jewish names,[36] would seem quite natural in this context and add to the evidence of anti-Christian sentiments collected up till now.

---

[34] *Apol.* 90,6; translation as in earlier quotations (again with small changes).

[35] For Moses, cf. references in L.H. Feldman, *Jew and gentile in the ancient world* (Princeton NJ 1993) 285-287. For Jesus, cf. e.g. Cels. *Contra Chr.* [ap.Orig. *Contra Cels.*] 1,6b and 2,48-49 (cf. also 1,28; 1,68 and 1,71); Arnob. *Adv.Nat.* 1,43; see further M. Smith, *Jesus the magician* (London 1978) 45-67; Benko (above, note 34), 103-139; G. Anderson, *Sage, saint and sophist. Holy men and their associates in the Early Roman Empire* (London/New York 1994). For the suggestion to read *Jesus* in *Apol.* 90, see also Benko, 108; and D. Tripp, The baker's wife and her confidante in Apuleius, *Met.* IX,14ff. Some liturgiological [sic!] considerations, *Emerita* 56 (1988) 245-254, esp. 251.

[36] The fact that Christians were often considered to be a Jewish sect could well explain the occurrence of both names together.

Silence

So *was* Aemilianus a Christian? This question must at least remain unanswered, as we have only Apuleius' biased and one-sided defence to go by. It seems unlikely, on the whole, that a real Christian would sue a famous orator for magic, a charge to which he could easily have been liable himself, given the general prejudices against Christians. At this point, I would not venture to go so far as Griset and others did.

But in the end, *truth* is not what matters to Apuleius in his speech: all he wants is to persuade the judge and win his case. He employs every possible means to blacken and deprecate his opponents. Part of his strategy is to picture Aemilianus as an enemy of Roman religion, much along the lines of anti-Christian polemics as we know them from the apologists. On the other hand, he proudly presents himself as a devotee of the pagan religion which plays such a major role in all his works, including the *Met.* In both rhetorical strategies, I would argue, he shows a reaction to Christianity, which must have been 'in the air' in Africa by the time of his defence.

This does not mean, however, that in Apuleius' eyes Christianity was to be taken entirely seriously. To an established orator and scholar like Apuleius, steeped in Roman culture, Christianity cannot have counted as a relevant school of thought worthy of academic discussion, or as something to be openly combatted or even to be mentioned in public: it was no more than a despicable sect and so a convenient target for satire and rhetorically effective insinuations.

This would imply an important corrective to the theory that the Isis religion of the *Met.* was presented as an *alternative* for paganism. Given all these indications, Christianity cannot have been entirely unknown to the speaker, the officials, and the attending audience. But it is Apuleius' silence in the *Apology* and other works which is the most telling: as he does not mention the Christians by name, they remain outside his direct focus. They are simply not considered 'salonfähig'. Whatever is ridiculed is not taken seriously.

In consequence, Apuleius does not seem to present a proper alternative, although he may well have felt inspired to underscore pagan religious elements more strongly. But it is merely traditional religion which he presents, not the alternative to a new religion.

Surveying this material, one may confirm the theory on anti-Christian sentiments in the *Met.* by extending it to Apuleius' other works, notably the *Apology*. On the other hand, Apuleius' silence and his satirical and

scornful attitude suggest that he does not take the new religion very seriously, but, at best, as a useful target to make clever insinuations against his opponents.

In this Apuleius would be completely in harmony with the attitude of much of the male Roman elite in the first centuries throughout the Empire. As in many other areas, he seems to be an exponent of the traditional ancient culture which would prove so slow to change into a Christian culture.

The case of Pudentilla

Considering Apuleius as an exponent of the 'male' elite, one is tempted to consider for a moment Apuleius' wife, Pudentilla. In the *Apology*, Apuleius pictures her in various ways, dependent upon his rhetorical aim of the moment. She in turn appears as a sensible housewife and a rational landowner, an unattractive woman madly in love, and suffering from disease, or as a literary model of wisdom.[37] But some elements in her portrait must have been beyond doubt: she is an extremely rich widow, who has lived chastely for more than ten years after her husband had died and who marries Apuleius for good, medical reasons. She knows Greek, is even able to write it, and devotes part of her time to studying. She also lavishly donates money to the people on the occasion of her son's wedding, but she herself remarries secretly in a country house, partly to avoid all the obligatory visits and meetings (87,11). By ancient standards, the last element is a remarkable expression of unsociable behaviour.

This rich and cultured woman is bound to have been interested in religion, given the social and intellectual climate of her age. But conversely, she might also have been an interesting woman for the young Christian church. Especially in late antiquity, many rich widows were known as supporters of the church.[38] Pudentilla would, for one thing, perfectly fit the profile of the decent female benefactor.

However, by remarrying in the first place, and by choosing a non-Christian husband of a lower social rank in an attempt to safeguard her freedom and financial interests, Pudentilla can hardly qualify as a celibate

---

[37] On the various images of Pudentilla, see: Vincent Hunink, The enigmatic Lady Pudentilla, *AJP* 119 (1998) 275-291.

[38] For further references and literature, see: Jan Bremmer, Pauper or patroness. The widow in the Early Christian Church, in: Jan Bremmer, Lourens van den Brink (edd.), *Between poverty and the pyre. Moments in the history of widowhood* (London/New York 1995) 31-57; J.-U. Krause, *Witwen und Waisen IV* (Stuttgart 1994).

Christian widow. In fact, she seems to break about every rule set out by Tertullian for Christian widows in his *Ad uxorem*, composed only two generations after Apuleius in Africa.[39] In this interesting treatise on the position and moral duties of Christian widows, women like Pudentilla seem quite out of place in the African church. At best she could be regarded as the model of a rich pagan woman *not* attracted by the church: *sordent talibus ecclesiae* (2,8,3).

More importantly, there is simply no evidence in Apuleius' text to assume that Pudentilla held any Christian sympathies. On the contrary, in a letter to her son which is paraphrased in the text (70,5-8), she says her son is fit for marriage 'by the will of the gods': *deum voluntate* (70,7). This may only be a conventional expression, but even then, the reference to more than one God seems to exclude any thought of Christianity.

For the later Christian author Sidonius Apollinaris (5th cent.), Pudentilla does not seem to be a special case. In a letter to a friend, in which he advises him to read incessantly, he adds:

> Neque patiaris ut te ab hoc proposito propediem coniunx domum feliciter ducenda deflectat, sisque oppido meminens quod olim Marcia Hortensio, Terentia Tullio, Calpurnia Plinio, Pudentilla Apuleio, Rusticiana Symmacho legentibus meditantibusque candelas et candelabra tenuerunt.
>
> You must not allow the thought that you will soon be happily married to turn you from this determination, ever remembering that in the old times of Marcia and Hortensius, Terentia and Tullius, Calpurnia and Pliny, Pudentilla and Apuleius, Rusticiana and Symmachus, the wives held candles and candlesticks for their husbands whilst they read and composed.[40]

Thus we see Pudentilla presented as an example of the loyal wife of a famous writer. But a Christian woman holding candlesticks for her openly pagan husband, who freely wrote on Roman Gods and demons, to say nothing of magic and sex? That seems quite inconceivable.[41]

Universiteit Leiden
Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen

---

[39] See: Tertullien, *A son épouse*, introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes de Charles Munier (Paris 1980) (Sources Chrétiennes 273). On p. 9 the date of composition is discussed; scholars place it between 193 and 206 AD.

[40] Sid.Ap. *Epist.* 2,10,5. The translation by W.B. Anderson is quoted from: Sidonius, Poems and letters, Loeb Classical Library nr. 296, p. 317.

[41] I thank dr. V. Schmidt (Groningen) and prof.dr. Jan Bremmer (Groningen) for their useful comments on earlier versions of this article.

REVIEWS

Recherches Augustiniennes 29 (1996), Paris, Institut des Études Augustiniennes. ISSN 0484-0887 (Diffusion: Brepols, Turnhout, Belgium).

Neben einem Vorwort von J.-C. Fredouille sind in diesem Band sieben Aufsätze vereinigt, von welchen sechs sprachliche Besonderheiten sei es der lateinischen christlichen Spätantike allgemein, sei es einzelner Autoren dieser Epoche behandeln; der letzte hingegen ist einem literarischen Thema der griechischen Patristik gewidmet. Mit Ausnahme eines einzigen wurden die Beiträge als Referate bei der 12th International Conference on Patristic Studies 1995 in Oxford vorgestellt und liegen jetzt auch z. T. in Studia Patristica XXIX und XXXI vor. Einige wiederum entsprechen Vorträgen, die an der Universität Paris-Sorbonne in Zusammenhang mit der Bearbeitung des „Manuel du latin chrétien" von A. Blaise gehalten wurden.

Als ausgezeichnete Einführung in die Fragestellung steht der Artikel „'Latin chrétien' ou 'latin tardif'" von J.-C. Fredouille an der Spitze. Trotz der sachlich nicht gerechtfertigten Konzentration auf literarische Texte, die das reiche inschriftliche Material beiseite läßt, kann sich der Leser über die aktuell diskutierten Probleme einen guten Überblick verschaffen. Lediglich die Auswahl der zitierten Sekundärliteratur erscheint einseitig: Die 17 beispielhaft angeführten Titel zur Periodisierung des Latein sind französische Publikationen, nur Leggewies „Die Welt der Römer", bekanntlich eine populärwissenschaftliche Darstellung, fällt aus diesem Rahmen. Gerade in einem Artikel, der Studierenden empfohlen werden könnte, hätten die Arbeiten von Chr. Mohrmann und ihrer Schule breitere Erwähnung verdient (z. B. S. 18).

Auch der zweite Artikel (O. García de La Fuente, „Latín bíblico y latín cristiano: coincidencias y discrepancias") stellt sich in den Dienst der Propädeutik. Für die Diskussion von Gemeinsamkeiten und Differenzen zwischen Bibellatein und christlichem Latein wurde die Arbeit von R. Braun, „L'influence de la Bible sur la langue latine" (in: Le monde latin antique et la Bible, Paris 1985, 129-142), als Ausgangspunkt gewählt. In der Darstellung der Hebraismen im christlichen Latein greift der Autor nicht über das von ihm in seiner Monographie gleichen Titels (Madrid 1994) Gesagte hinaus.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

Einen interessanten Ansatz verfolgt der Beitrag von M. Fruyt über „La syntaxe de l'infinitif en latin tardif: Réflexions sur la nature des processus évolutifs": In Zusammenhang mit verschiedenen im Spätlatein vermehrt belegten Infinitivkonstruktionen (z. B. *habeo* mit Infinitiv) wird die These diskutiert, daß ihre Ausbreitung als Einfluß des Griechischen zu werten sei. Da eine Antwort auf der Basis historisch-vergleichender Überlegungen zur Funktion des Infinitivs in indogermanischen Sprachen gegeben wird, muß sie negativ ausfallen. Auch wenn, wie gezeigt wird, keine der Funktionen des Infinitivs schlüssig als Gräzismus identifiziert werden muß, weil die jeweilige Konstruktion entweder bereits im Altlatein verwendet wurde oder so enge Parallelen außerhalb des griechisch-lateinischen Bereichs hat, daß sie als gemein-indogermanisch gelten kann, ist doch ein methodologischer Vorbehalt angezeigt: Solange die Frage nicht gestellt wird, wieso diese Konstruktionen eben in der Nachklassik mit Vorliebe verwendet wurden, in einer Epoche also, in der das griechische Bildungsgut im lateinischen Westen stark wirkte, ist das Griechische als (eventuell unbewußtes) Vorbild nicht auszuschließen; es ist durchaus denkbar, daß im Altlatein belegte Konstruktionen in der Nachklassik unter dem Einfluß griechischer Parallelkonstruktionen wiederbelebt wurden.

Einem engeren Thema ist der gelungene Beitrag von F. Chapot („La préverbation en *prae* chez Tertullien") gewidmet: In den mit *prae* gebildeten Verbalkomposita, darunter viele meist kurzlebige Neologismen, behält das Präfix fast immer sein (temporales) Bedeutungslement; wie anhand der interessantesten Belegstellen gezeigt wird, unterscheidet sich darin *prae* von *pro*, das von Tertullian mitunter aus rein klanglichen Gründen verwendet wurde.

Hinter dem bloß sprachliche Beobachtungen ankündigenden Titel des (fünften) Beitrags von S. Deléani, „La syntaxe des titres dans les recueils scripturaires de saint Cyprien", verbirgt sich eine philologische Kostbarkeit: Aus den grammatikalisch unterschiedlich formulierten *tituli* von Cyprians *Ad Quirinum* und *Ad Fortunatum* wird in schlüssiger Argumentation, für die ein Vergleich mit Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, eingesetzt wird, ein inhaltliches Differenzierungskriterium gewonnen: Das Ergebnis, daß Infinitivkonstruktionen in der Formulierung des *titulus* auf Aphorismen und allgemeine Lebensweisheiten hinweisen, hingegen *quod*-Sätze für Glaubenswahrheiten verwendet werden, ist ein deutlicher Beleg dafür, wie sehr selbst diffizile sprachliche Beobachtungen zum fundamentalen Textverständnis beitragen können.

Sprachliche Kompetenz ist auch für den Artikel von C. Ingremeau, „Faits de langue tardive, effets de style, ou problèmes textuels? (Quelques

exemples chez Commodien; bilan sur le livre VI des *Institutions divines* de Lactance)", signifikativ: Er behandelt textkritische Probleme zunächst bei Commodian—hier ist die von J. Soubiran zu instr. 2, 5 (CSEL 15, 71f.) vorgeschlagene Ergänzung, *aut si intrare potest, si<c> nec cessa<re necessest>*, eine attraktive Lösung—, dann bei Laktanz. Der Grundtenor des Artikels liegt darin, die Relevanz der handschriftlichen Überlieferung gegen die Forderungen der Grammatik (der klassischen Epoche) zu verteidigen; somit können einige Konjekturen der CSEL-Edition als unnötig erwiesen werden.

Den Abschluß bildet der in diesem Band wie ein Fremdkörper wirkende, doch sehr interessante Artikel von M.-G. Guérard über „Éléments de romanesque dans le *Commentaire sur le Cantique* de Nil d'Ancyre". Die These, daß die Exegese des Hohelieds des Nilus dem Genus des Romans nahesteht—es handelt sich also um eine rein literarische Analyse mit werktranszendenter Reflexion—, wird anhand von Vergleichen mit Longos, Daphnis und Chloe, erhärtet. Somit ist das Werk ein Beispiel für christliche Ersatzliteratur, das von dem „wahren" Liebespaar, der Seele und ihrem Bräutigam, handelt.

Zusammenfassend kann festgehalten werden, daß der Band gerade durch die Vereinigung propädeutischer und streng wissenschaftlicher Beiträge zu verschiedenen Spezialthemen Studierenden wie Forschern eine solide Grundlage, anregende Denkansätze und weiterführende Ergebnisse vermittelt. Die Lektüre ist ein Gewinn.

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften DOROTHEA WEBER
A – 1010 *Wien,* Sonnenfelsgasse 19

Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen (A New History of the Sermon, 1). Brill, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1998. 370 pp., DFL 175/US $ 103. ISBN: 9004106812.

In the past decade or so, not in the least thanks to the efforts of the volume editors, the study of patristic homiletic texts came to focus more and more on both the preacher and his audience. *Preacher and Audience* should be seen as a first evaluation of the fruits of this approach, succinctly indicated as 'Preacher-Audience analysis'. Indeed, contrary to what the title of the series suggests, this is not a comprehensive study of the homiletic production of the indicated period. Instead of a handbook of Greek

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

preaching, it is a series of case studies on Greek speaking preachers and audiences from the second to the tenth century. 'Preacher-Audience analysis' can then best be seen as a wide array of quite different approaches out of which one can select those that suit best the homilies to be studied. Given the deliberate limitation to Greek texts, a more precise title (e.g. 'Greek Preachers and their Audiences') would have been more apposite. The book in any case calls for a companion volume on Latin preaching and, why not, one on Coptic and Syriac.

The nicely published volume opens with a good introduction by the editors and 'Some Reflections on Problems Raised by Early Christian Preaching' by Dom A. Olivar. Thereafter follow case studies on 'Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher' (A. Stewart-Sykes); 'Origen the Scholar and Pastor' (A. Monaci Castagno); 'The Three Cappadocians on Benificence' (A. Meredith); 'John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience' (W. Mayer); 'Severian of Gabala's Use of the Diatribe' (K.-H. Uthemann); Proclus of Constantinople (J. Barkhuizen); 'The Sixth-Century Greek Homily' (P. Allen); Anastasios of Sinai (J. Munitiz); 'St John Damascene: Preacher and Poet' (A. Louth); 'Andrew of Crete' (M. Cunningham); 'Photios and George of Nicomedia' (N. Tsironis); 'Homiletic Activity in Constantinople around 900' (T. Antonopoulou). Each essay is rounded off by a bibliography of the used primary and secondary sources. In the essay on Proclus I missed his short homily on S. Stephen (PG 63, cols. 933-934), transmitted in the corpus of John Chrysostom, and edited by M. Aubineau in the Festschrift for G. Bartelink. Yet this text is a little gem since it places Proclus (once more) within the context of the imperial family: with 'the empress-virgin' probably Pulcheria is meant and it is not unlikely that the homily was delivered in the Church of St. Stephen in the imperial palace of Daphne, perhaps even in Pulcheria's presence.

In my view the dispersed character of the book, a feature it shares with many other volumes of collected studies, is to a certain extent also its strength. Indeed, since 'Preacher-Audience analysis' can indicate a variety of possible approaches, it is the merit of the book that it represents a variety of "experiments" in coming to grips with homiletic material. The only recurring element is that the authors try to collect as much information as possible on both the preacher and his audience(s) as well as on the interaction between both. The possibilities of such an approach of course depend largely on the quantity and quality of information the homilies contain. So Mary Cunningham has to throw the towel in the ring: the homilies of Andrew of Crete 'contain so little information on the congre-

gation that she focuses on the preacher himself' (p. 268). But in some other essays too not much more could be done than present the homiletic material and describe, without much coherence, the nuggets of information that could be gleaned from the texts. In particular the preachers who flourished after the seventh century, such as John Damascene, George of Nicomedia and the Emperor Leo VI, provide very few details about their audiences. At the other end of the spectrum is the chapter devoted to John Chrysostom, in which one can find a systematic sketch of the method pushed to the limits of its possibilities. Mayer touches upon virtually every way of looking to a homily: as a piece of rhetoric, as reflecting a particular social setting, as a part of liturgy. She explores the church building, the social make-up of the congregation, the different congregations John addressed, the time of preaching, the interaction between preacher and audience . . . In sum, she offers an almost complete checklist of what can be done with homilies. Another article I found very inspiring for further research is the one by Uthemann on the diatribic style of Severian of Gabala. It is an approach that, with the necessary cautiousness, could be fruitfully used to study the interaction between preacher and audience in many other authors too.

I end by indicating a possible avenue for research on homiletic texts that I found unsufficiently highlighted in *Preacher and Audience*. I refer to the interaction between the preacher, his audience and the space they find themselves in. One would suspect that, just like in the Western Middle Ages, the wall decorations, the icons and other visual elements functioned as a kind of *Biblia pauperum*. Would it be too far-fetched or hypothetical to look how the message of the preacher (e.g. in exegetical homilies) and the message of the church building related to each other and to the audience? To conclude: this book opens ways of inquiry and offers examples of what can be done. Many questions are still unresolved or hardly addressed. Large areas of research lay open and await further study. It is the merit of this book to indicate possible ways to address the problems ahead, not hiding the many difficulties. Thus it is an important markstone on the way to the more "definitive" history of the Greek Patristic and Byzantine homily.

Faculty of Theology JOHAN LEEMANS
St. Michielsstraat, 6, B-3000 *Leuven*

St. Leo the Great: Sermons, translated by Jane Patricia Freeland and Agnes Josephine Conway (The Fathers of the Church 93). Washington, The Catholic University of America Press, 1996. XII + 436 pp., £29.95.

Since a long time, an English translation of the sermons of St. Leo the Great has been an urgent wish. Indeed, the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series has a volume with some of the Pope's sermons and letters in English, but this selection is too limited and, moreover, in several aspects, both the translation and the commentary are clearly out of date. It is, therefore, highly praiseworthy that two American scholars have endeavoured to translate the whole corpus of the Leonine sermons. In R. Dolle they had a trustful predecessor, since this scholar provided a translation of Leo's sermons in the *Sources Chrétiennes* (*SC* 22, 49, 74, 200, Paris 1964, 1969, 1971, 1973). So, it was to be hoped that an equivalent English translation would now see the light, which would make Leo Magnus' work more easily accessible for a wider public.

At first sight, the translators seem to have achieved that goal. The English translation is pleasant to read, and is of a constant level. A closer look, however, reveals some shortcomings of both the translation and the treatment of the Latin text (the principal edition of which is that by A. Chavasse in the *Corpus Christianorum: CCL* 138-138A, Turnhout 1973). Here, I will concentrate on the so-called anti-Manichaean sermons that Leo delivered in the years 443 and 444.

The editor or translator of Leo's sermons has to take into account that the Pope revised some of his orations at a later stage. These revisions resulted in an α-text and a β-text. It seems to be preferable to deal with the β-text in an appendix, so that it does not disturb the course of the original text. Freeland and Conway, however, have printed the translation of the β-text together with that of the α-text, which sometimes leads to an unpleasant layout. What is more important, however, is that the two versions are not always correctly indicated. On p. 184, for instance, the translators suggest that the two versions are identical, whereas there are some considerable differences. Thus, the α-text says that those people that devote their fasts to the sun and the moon undoubtedly are the Manichaeans. In contrast, the β-text does not mention these people by name. While the first redaction declares that they fast 'on the day of the Lord and a second holiday' (*die dominico et secunda feria*), the second refers to these days of fasting as 'the first and second day of the week' (*prima et secunda sabbati*), which

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

suggests the Monday as a second day of fasting among the Manichaeans. Freeland and Conway rather inaccurately (and indiscriminately) translate both expressions by 'on Sunday and Monday'.

On the same page 184, '[their own appetite]' should be marked as a translation of the β-text. The same goes for the words 'and subordinates' on p. 185. Again, in *Sermo* LXXVI, 7, the β-text replaces *sacrilegarum* ('sacrilegious') by *ridendarum* ('ridiculous'), a change which the translators fail to indicate. These few examples may suffice to indicate that they have not been very careful in distinguishing the two editions of Leo's sermons.

Freeland and Conway render the Latin name *Manes* identically in English, which is defendable, although the common rendering is 'Mani'. It is more serious that the translators seem to ignore the fact that the Latin word *Manichaeus* can mean both 'Manichaean' and 'Mani'. So, on p. 203, Leo's *aut secundum Manichaeum nulla eius sit resurrectio*, is rendered with 'according to the Manichaeans, there is no resurrection' etc., a painful mistake. In the same manner, on p. 402, *in Manichaei dementia* has become 'in the madness of the Manichaeans'. The translators do not seem to have made any special study of Mani and his religion.

Some omissions and mistakes may be more pardonable. On p. 61, the translators have overlooked the words *ut multum*, so that the translation should run: 'a girl who was no more than ten years old'. The word *gesta* in Leo's works usually means 'proceedings', and not 'deeds' (p. 62). Again, on p. 63, some words have been omitted (*auxiliante Domino*: 'the Lord being its helper', after 'but let the same investigation continue'). On p. 147, the phrase *quibus fuerit superfusa* should not be rendered by 'with which it may be surrounded', but by 'over which it was poured out'. The word *resultantes* ('resisting') in *Sermo* XLII, 4 (α-text) has been forgotten on p. 183, while the words *edaces et bibaces* (*ibid.*) deserve a more powerful translation than 'eaters and drinkers'.

The book provides an introduction to the life and work of Leo the Great that is quite to the point. The bibliography (pp. ix-xii), however, is conspicuous for its inaccuracies. To mention the most important ones: the name of the second author of the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* is A. Gaar. It was not some 'Eddy G.' who participated in the edition of the *Corpus Christianorum Instrumenta Lexicologica Latina, Series* B, 40, but E. Gouder. It is evident that the translators are unfamiliar with the Dutch language. The title of the Dutch translation of some works of Leo the Great by A. Huyg correctly runs: '*Sint Leo de Groote: Over de menschwording van Christus. Leerstellige*

brieven en preeken', etc. The correct bibliographical data of the Dutch translation of a selection of Leo's sermons by F. Vromen are: *'Leo de Grote: Preken voor het liturgisch jaar, Oosterhout 1960-1 (in four volumes)'*.

Those who are eager to read the sermons of St. Leo the Great in English will be pleased with this new translation. Without a doubt, it facilitates a quick introduction to Leo's sermons. On a deeper level, however, it reveals itself as somewhat disappointing and deceptive.

NL-3583 AD *Utrecht*, Adr. van Ostadelaan 109B H.G. SCHIPPER

A. Louth, *Maximus the Confessor* (*The Early Church Fathers*, ed. by Carol Harrison). Routledge, London – New York, 1996, 230 pp.

Andrew Louth's *Maximus the Confessor* wants to provide an introduction to the theological thinking of Maximus the Confessor, a goal the author hopes to achieve by providing translations of some of Maximus' major theological treatises, especially *Ambigua ad Thomam*[1] and *Ambigua ad Johannem*.[2] The translations have been preceded by an ample general introduction (pp. 1-77) and are followed by explanatory notes (pp. 199-219). A bibliography of texts and translations of Maximus, other texts and translations, and secondary literature (pp. 220-225), together with an index (pp. 226-230), complete the volume.

Chapter 1 of the general introduction to the translations deals with the biography of the Confessor and the political and politico-religious backgrounds of his life. Here, appropriate attention has been paid to the most important politico-religious controversies of the seventh century A.D., monenergism and monothelitism. These compromises are placed in an evolution that starts with the Nicene Creed of 325 and ends with the sixth Oecumenical Council (Constantinople, 680/1) where they were finally abandoned. In Chapter 2, Louth elaborates on the various sources Maximus has drawn on in his thinking, a domain on which the author has already been active on various other occasions.[3] Finally, the different aspects of Maximus' theological thinking are briefly introduced: spiritual theology and the importance of asceticism in Maximus' life and thinking, his doctrine with regard to the person of Christ, and his cosmic theology.

As a future editor of Maximus' *Ambigua ad Thomam*, I will focus on Chapter 4 of the introduction (pp. 48-62: 'The Doctrine of the Person of Christ') and on the translations of *Ambigua ad Thomam* 1 and 5 (pp. 169-179).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

However, before turning our attention to Louth's translations, I would like to make a remark on terminology: the question if Maximus himself ever considered the *Ambigua ad Thomam* and the *Ambigua ad Johannem* to be parts of a single work, has aroused a good deal of scholarly discussion.[4] It is evident that both works have in any case been circulating separately too; that they are to be assigned to different periods of the Confessor's life; and that they have been dedicated to different persons. Therefore—for reasons of principle as well as clarity—we have to adopt the names *Ambigua ad Thomam* and *Ambigua ad Johannem*[5] and dismiss the vague designations 'early' and 'later ambigua' which Louth probably uses in the footsteps of P. Sherwood.[6]

Although both the editor of the series and Louth himself stress the necessity of an accessible modern translation of 'key texts by the major Fathers', Louth's translation of Maximus leaves a lot to be desired. First of all, his negligent treatment of the original Greek text has been the cause of a number of annoying mistakes in the translations. For example:

– Louth, p. 173 (= PG 91, 1049B): "water is unstable, and *cannot receive or support* material and earthly feet", for: ὕδωρ ἄστατον, ὑλικῶν καὶ γεηρῶν ποδῶν *ἀνέχον* βάρος *καὶ μὴ ὑπεῖκον*;

– p. 173 (PG 91, 1049C): μετὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης οὐσίας has not been translated;

– p. 174 (PG 91, 1049D-1052A): "Therefore *he* (sc. the Word) did not abrogate the constitutive energy of the assumed nature, *nor* does *the teacher* support *such a notion* when he says", for: οὐκ ἀνεῖλεν οὖν τὴν συστατικὴν τῆς προσληφθείσης οὐσίας ἐνέργειαν, ὥσπερ οὐδ'*αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν ὁ διδάσκαλος* εἰπών· etc.;

– on p. 174 (PG 91, 1052 A12-B5) Louth has failed to notice the parallellism 'ἢ . . . ἢ . . .'. The result is an uncomprehensible translation;

– p. 175 (PG 91, 1053A): δίκην σπορᾶς "without seed", for: 'in the way of the seed';

– p. 175 (PG 91, 1053C): "and by the authority of his intention he made what we suffer *something positive*, but *not as if we were* the results of natural necessity, and again, *working within what we are capable of*, he passes through what we suffer by nature", for: ἐξουσίᾳ γνώμης ἔργα πεποιηκὼς τὰ πάθη τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ'οὐχ'ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀνάγκης ἀποτελέσματα φυσικῆς· ἔμπαλιν ἢ ἐφ'ἡμῶν ἔχει, τὸ καθ'ἡμᾶς φύσει παθητὸν διεξῆλθεν.

– p. 177 (PG 91, 1056C): "accomplishing both divinely things", for: ἤγουν θεϊκῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀνδρικῶς τά τε θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα δράσας; etc.

All these and several other mistakes in Louth's translations are not just annoying, but they sometimes even twist Maximus' theology in a way the Confessor himself would not have agreed upon. For example this passage (p. 173, PG 91, 1049C): "For the movement that can make such a crossing is constituted by a nature belonging to *no-one else than the Godhead*, that is beyond infinity and being, united to it hypostatically", for: εἴπερ φύσει ταύτης (sc. τῆς σαρκὸς) ἡ μεταβατικὴ καθέστηκε κίνησις, *ἀλλ'οὐ τῆς* ἡνωμένης αὐτῇ καθ'ὑπόστασιν ὑπεραπείρου καὶ ὑπερουγίου *θεότητος*.

Another example is: "for this 'newness' is *not* a matter of quality *or* quantity", for: ποιότητος γὰρ *ἀλλ'οὐ* ποσότητος ἡ καινότης. (p. 177, PG 91, 1057A)

An example from Louth's translation of *Opusculum 3* (p. 194, PG 91, 48C): "For the Incarnation is an effective demonstration of both nature and the economy, I mean of the natural logos of what has been united, *confirming* the mode of the hypostatic union, *and* '*instituting* afresh the natures', without any change or confusion." The Greek text of the passage is: εἴπερ ἡ σάρκωσις, ἐναργής ἐστι φύσεως καὶ οἰκονομίας ἀπόδειξις· *τοῦ τε* φυσικοῦ λέγω τῶν ἡνωμένων λόγου, *καὶ τοῦ* καθ'ὑπόστασιν τῆς ἑνώσεως τρόπου, *τοῦ μὲν* πιστουμένου, *τοῦ δὲ* καινοτομοῦντος τὰς φύσεις, δίχα τροπῆς καὶ συγχύσεως.

These were just a few examples: "non placuit . . . omnia istius errata corrigere, quod majoris erat molestiae".[7]

It is hard to believe that the author of this kind of translations has been able to provide such a sound and correct introduction to them.[8] Indeed, Chapter 4 is a very accessible introduction to the christological thinking of Maximus the Confessor and a correct synthesis of it, but it goes without saying that the real sources for further study of Maximus' thinking, *i.e.*, the Confessor's works, have not become more accessible by this edition. On the contrary, the numerous inaccuracies and definite errors in the translations might in the future result in some strange conclusions about Maximus' theological thinking.

Instituut voor Vroegchristelijke en Byzantijnse Studies, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21,
B-3000 Leuven

BART JANSSENS

[1] *CPG Supplementum* 7705 (1); ed. PG 91, 1032-1060 = Fr. Oehler, *S. Maximi Confessoris de variis difficilibus locis SS. PP. Dionysii et Gregorii liber (Anecdota Graeca I)*, Halle, 1857, pp. 1-35. The present writer is preparing a critical edition of the *Ambigua ad Thomam* (as well as the *Epistula secunda ad eundem*) for the Series Graeca of the Corpus Christianorum (CCSG).

[2] *CPG Supplementum* 7705 (2); ed. PG 91, 1061-1417 = Oehler, pp. 35-405. A critical edition is being prepared by professor C. Laga, Leuven.

[3] Cf. A. Louth, 'St Gregory the Theologian and St Maximus the Confessor: the Shaping of Tradition', in: S. Coakley – D. A. Pailin (eds.), *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine: Essays in Honour of Maurice Wiles*, Oxford, 1993, pp. 117-130; Id., 'St Denys the Areopagite and St Maximus the Confessor: a Question of Influence', in: *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993), pp. 166-174 and A. Louth – J. Raitt, *Wisdom of the Byzantine Church: Evagrios of Pontos and Maximos the Confessor (Paine Lectures in Religion 1997: Four Lectures by Andrew Louth, edited by Jill Raitt)*, Columbia (Miss.), 1998.

[4] Supporters of the opinion he did, are: P. Sherwood, *An Annotated Date-list of the Works of Maximus the Confessor* (*Studia Anselmiana* 30), Rome, 1952, p. 32; Id., *The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and his Refutation of Origenism* (*Studia Anselmiana* 36), Rome, 1955, pp. 23, 39-40; P. Canart, 'La deuxième lettre à Thomas de S. Maxime le Confesseur', in: *Byzantion* 34 (1964), p. 416, n. 2; E. Jeauneau, *Maximi Confessoris* Ambigua ad Ioannem *iuxta Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem*, CCSG 18, Turnhout – Leuven, 1988, p. xii. Against the opinion that Maximus united both works himself is: R. Bracke, 'Some Aspects of the Manuscript Tradition of the Ambigua of Maximus the Confessor', in: F. Heinzer – C. Schönborn (eds.) *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980* (*Paradosis* 27), Fribourg, 1982, pp. 98 and 108.

[5] Cf. Bracke, 'Manuscript Tradition', p. 97; Jeauneau, 'Jean l'Erigène et les Ambigua ad Iohannem de Maxime le Confesseur', in: Heinzer – Schönborn (eds.), *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium*, p. 348; Id., CCSG 18, pp. ix-xiii and n. 21.

[6] On p. 82 only, Louth makes a clear distinction between the two collections of 'ambigua', assigning them their proper names.

[7] Thomas Gale on Johannes Scotus Eriugena's translation of Maximus' *Ambigua ad Johannem* [Th. Gale, *Joannis Scoti Erigenae de Divisione Naturae Libri quinque diu desiderati. Accedit Appendix ex Ambiguis S. Maximi graece et latine*, Frankfurt am Main, 1964 (= Oxford, 1681), Appendix p. 82].

[8] Ch. 4. 'The Doctrine of the Person of Christ', pp. 48-62; on *Amb. Tho.* 5, cf. pp. 54-56. We should note however that there is no reference to be found to E. Bellini, 'Maxime interprète de pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite. Analyse de l'Ambiguum ad Thomam 5', in: Heinzer – Schönborn (eds.), *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium*, pp. 37-49. (For the acts of the symposium as a whole, cf. Louth's bibliography, p. 224).

Franz Overbeck, Werke und Nachlaß
Bd. 1: *Schriften bis 1873*, Hg. M. Stauffacher-Schaub, E. W. Stegemann, N. Peter. Stuttgart/Weimar, J. B. Metzler. 1994. X, 337 S.
Bd. 2: *Schriften bis 1880*, Hg. M. Stauffacher-Schaub, E. W. Stegemann, R. Brändle. Stuttgart/Weimar, J. B. Metzler. 1994. IX, 576 S.
Bd. 4 und 5: *Kirchenlexicon. Texte. Ausgewählte Artikel*, Hg. M. Stauffacher-Schaub, B. von Reibnitz. Stuttgart/Weimar, J. B. Metzler. 1995. XLIV, 692 / XX, 762 S.
Bd. 6/1: *Kirchenlexicon. Materialien. Christentum und Kultur*, Hg. B. von Reibnitz. Stuttgart/Weimar, J. B. Metzler. 1996. X, 345 S.
Bd. 6/2: *Kirchenlexicon. Materialien. Gesamtinventar*, Hg. B. von Reibnitz, M. Stauffacher-Schaub. Stuttgart/Weimar, J. B. Metzler. 1997. IX, 388 S.

Franz Overbeck (1837-1905) wirkte nach seiner Privatdozentenzeit in Jena die längste Zeit seines Gelehrtenlebens, nämlich 1870-1897, als Professor für kritische Theologie mit den Fachgebieten Neues Testament und Ältere Kirchengeschichte in Basel. Dementsprechend verknüpfen viele seiner Arbeiten beide Themenfelder. Overbeck ist eine der zentralen Gestalten des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts: Er war beeinflußt von der historischen Kritik und dem Geschichtsmodell Ferdinand Christian Baurs (vgl. Bd. 1, S. 97–99) und auch von Friedrich Nietzsche, mit dem er befreundet war. Die Beziehung zu Nietzsche hat immer wieder wissenschaftliche Aufmerksamkeit gefunden. Overbeck sah sich selbst als kritischen Geist, der auf das „rein Historische" zielte. Leidenschaftlich wandte er sich in gelegentlich maßloser Kritik gegen Harnack („ein nicht unbegabter Confusionarius", Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 446), und zwar sowohl gegen dessen Schrift „Das Wesen des Christentums" wie gegen dessen historische Methode, die Overbeck der Kritiklosigkeit zieh (Bd. 4, S. 511): Harnack sei in Wahrheit Theologe, kein Historiker (Bd. 4, S. 513).

Die vorliegende und weiterhin im Entstehen begriffene Edition seines Nachlasses verdankt sich der gemeinsamen Arbeit vorwiegend Basler Gelehrter. Sie knüpfen damit an ein früheres, aber fragmentarisch gebliebenes Projekt C. A. Bernoullis an. Die Neuedition bietet aber auch eine Neuherausgabe der von Bernoulli erstellten Kompilation aus Overbecks Kirchenlexicon (Christentum und Kultur, Bd. 6/1.2), dokumentiert also schon ein Stück Rezeptionsgeschichte. Da dieses Material in den Bänden 4 und 5 in originaler Form dargeboten wird, muß die Aufbereitung in Bd. 6 hier keine weitere Erwähnung finden. Die Herausgeber haben auf eine

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

vollständige Herausgabe des Overbeckschen Œuvres verzichtet, so daß etwa die Neubearbeitung des von De Wette verfaßten Kommentars zur Apostelgeschichte fehlt. Die Texte sind mit Einleitungen versehen, die sie historisch erschließen, außerdem mit Sachanmerkungen und Quellenhinweisen. Die Anmerkungen in den Einleitungen bieten Material aus der aktuellen Forschung, die Overbecks spezifische Sicht beleuchten. Obwohl Overbecks Werk aus kleineren Abhandlungen besteht, kann doch das von ihm selbst nicht veröffentlichte und von ihm sozusagen als Datenbank mit Querverweisen erstellte Kirchenlexicon in gewisser Weise als Kompendium seiner Anschauungen angesehen werden.

Overbecks Werk ist für zeitgenössische Leserinnen und Leser unter zwei Hauptaspekten von Interesse: Zum einen mag man aus dem Abstand von rund 100 Jahren beobachten, welche kirchenhistorischen und vorwiegend patristischen Fragestellungen für Overbeck leitend waren und zu welchen vom heutigen Forschungsstand abweichenden fachwissenschaftlichen Ergebnissen er kam. Seine überaus gelehrten Studien zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche sind schon in literarischer Hinsicht immer noch lesenswert, auch wenn sie in vielem, etwa in der Überzeichnung der Weltverneinung des Frühen Christentums, „überholt" sind. Zum anderen ist aus kirchenhistorischer Sicht bemerkenswert, wie Overbeck seine Forschungsergebnisse in den Horizont des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts einordnete und wie er selbst das zeitgenössische Christentum sah. Ihm selbst lag an „der wissenschaftlichen Aufklärung über das Christenthum" (Studien zur Geschichte der alten Kirche, Bd. 2, S. 20), doch empfand er das Christentum im Jahre 1900 als „alt bis zur Hinfälligkeit" (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 149), und die „moderne Theologie" nur als ein Zeichen seiner Altersschwäche (Bd. 4, S. 150): „Das Christenthum ist das Phosphoresciren des verwesenden Alterthums" (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 157).

Die leitenden, und das heißt in erster Linie literaturgeschichtlichen, Fragestellungen und Erkenntnisse beziehen sich vor allem auf den Übergang von der urchristlichen zur altkirchlichen Literatur. So ergibt sich unter Hervorhebung einiger Einzelaspekte folgendes Bild, das im Laufe der Entstehungsgeschichte des Gesamtwerks immer schärfere Konturen gewinnt: Overbeck nimmt die alte Degenerationsthese modifiziert auf und sieht das Christentum in einem Prozeß von der eschatologisch geprägten Weltverneinung hin zur Verweltlichung: Der urchristliche Glaube an das Weltende stand gegen ein Bündnis mit der Welt (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 188). Aber auch die Annahme einer idealen Urepoche des Christentums verfällt der Kritik (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 5, S. 615). Das Mönchtum wiederum war

eine Reaktion auf das Staatskirchentum des 4. Jahrhunderts, denn es ließ sich in der Folge neutestamentlicher und frühchristlicher Ideale nicht für die antike Kultur vereinnahmen; auch das Mönchtum aber verfiel letztlich der Korrumpierung durch die Staatskirche (Ueber die Anfänge des Mönchthums, Bd. 1, S. 18f). Das Christentum übernahm die weltliche Bildung und damit auch eine weltliche Denkweise (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 63). Von Anfang an hat die Kirche den Staat und damit auch die Sklaverei gutgeheißen, und an einem positiven Einfluß des Christentums in der Gesellschaft fehlte es auch nach Konstantin (Ueber das Verhältnis der alten Kirche zur Sklaverei, Bd. 2, S. 158). Vor allem kritisierte Overbeck die unhistorische Normativität des neutestamentlichen Kanons: „Eine Katastrophe der Geschichte der christlichen Urlitteratur ist darum auch ihre Kanonisirung" (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 5, S. 65), denn dadurch wurden die kanonisierten Schriften einer kritischen historischen Betrachtungsweise enthoben (Zur Geschichte des Kanons, Bd. 2, S. 393).

Im Blick auf den zeitgenössischen Kontext sind die zum Teil überaus polemischen Schlüsse aus den historischen Erkenntnissen kennzeichnend, die sich allerdings vorwiegend in dem nicht zur Veröffentlichung autorisierten Material zum Kirchenlexicon finden – dieses polemische Bild entsteht auch deshalb, weil das eigentlich kirchenhistorische Material des Kirchenlexicons gar nicht in die Bände 4 und 5 eingegangen ist, wie die in Bd. 6/2 dokumentierte Stichwortliste zeigt, sondern letztlich die Kompilation Bernoullis den Rahmen für die Auswahl in den Bänden 4 und 5 abgesteckt hat. Overbeck stand in einem Spannungsfeld von historisch-apologetischer, zu immer größerem Erfolg kommender liberaler und von ihm vertretener kritischer Theologie (Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie, Bd. 1; dazu einzelne Artikel im Kirchenlexicon). Für das Frühe Christentum und das Mönchtum ist ein „Antagonismus des Christenthums gegen die Culturverhältnisse unter denen es aufwuchs" zu konstatieren (Ueber die Anfänge des Mönchthums, Bd. 1, S. 14). Es gilt die „Urzeit der Kirche" zu entdecken, die schon in der Alten Kirche in Vergessenheit geriet (Ueber Entstehung und Recht einer rein historischen Betrachtung, Bd. 1, S. 85). Die Alexandriner Clemens und Origenes haben die Wissenschaft über den Glauben gestellt (Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie, Bd. 1, S. 175). – Overbeck übersetzte im übrigen auch die Stromateis des Clemens. Um so mehr ist aber der Gegensatz von Religion und Wissen aufzuzeigen. Die von Overbeck gezogenen Schlüsse sind nicht nur kritisch, sondern abwertend: „Denn das Christenthum ist das unter uns am Leben gebliebene Stück Alterthum" (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 228), es ist also

ein historisches Relikt, und das „moderne Christentum" im Sinne Harnacks ist eine Farce. Das Aufgehen der Religion in der Kultur ist (wie in der Antike so in der Moderne) das Ende der Religion (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 4, S. 305).

Die weitere Rezeptionsgeschichte Overbecks (etwa bei Karl Barth und Karl Löwith) kann im Rahmen dieser Edition begreiflicherweise nicht dokumentiert werden. In jedem Falle regt das vorliegende Opus dazu an, selbstkritisch nach der Ortsbestimmung historischen Forschens im jeweils aktuellen Deutungsrahmen des Christentums in der Gesellschaft zu fragen. Overbecks nicht ausgeführtes Projekt einer „profanen Kirchengeschichte" mag im Sinne des Rufes zu historischer Wahrhaftigkeit in Erinnerung bleiben, doch ohne das harsche Urteil: „Als Parasit an der Tafel der Wissenschaft hat die Theologie so wenig Beruf zur Geschichtswissenschaft wie zu irgend einer anderen" (Kirchenlexicon, Bd. 5, S. 533).

D-24111 Kiel, Lankwitzweg 24 KLAUS FITSCHEN

Th.G. Sinnige, *Six Lectures on Plotinus and Gnosticism*, VII + 109 pp. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London 1999. ISBN 0-7923-5648-9, DFL 120.

The author of this book has achieved what Hans Jonas promised to do but never did: he wrote a book about the impact of Gnosticism on Plotinus.

Already before the Second World War his professor of philosophy at the university of Nijmegen, Ferdinand Sassen, initiated Sinnige into the difficult Greek of this oriental sage and the dynamic pantheism of his system. In 1963 he pointed out to the editors of *De Resurrectione, Epistula ad Rheginum*, the third writing of the *Jung Codex*, page XIX, that Plotinus' view on the resurrection (*Enn.* III, 6,6: "the true awakening is a resurrection from the body, not with the body") was an echo of Valentinian gnosis. Somewhat later, in 1966, he was appointed Senior Lecturer in Philosophy of Antiquity at his *alma mater*. He retired in 1985. Now he lives at Velp near Arnhem in the Netherlands. During all that time he was engrossed in Plotinus. And now he offers us his final word.

According to Sinnige, Plotinus describes his basic experience when he writes:

> Often, when I awake to myself from the body and come to be outside all other things and inside myself, I have a vision of immeasurable beauty. I feel sure that, if ever, I then inhabit the better part of myself, bringing to life the best of all lives and being united with the divine life and firmly established therein.
>
> *Ennead* IV 8 1.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

More specifically, Plotinus felt in the centre of his own being the presence of the ultimate and universal Self. Knowledge of your own self is knowledge of the Godhead.

In all his treatises Plotinus uses gnostic images: source, tree (cf. the *arbor inversa* of the *Tripartite Treatise* of the *Jung Codex*), light, journey, home, temple, and especially 'emanation': world and man are an overflow of the One. Sinnige proves convincingly that emanation is not to be found in Plato. It is characteristic of Gnosticism: according to Valentinus our world is a smile and a *tear* of Wisdom, *Sophia*. Plotinus must have introduced it into the Platonistic tradition, according to Sinnige. This is very probable, because this concept is still absent in the Middle Platonist Alexander of Lykopolis (± 250 A.D.), who reflects the ideas of Eudorus (100 B.C., Alexandria). And according to J.M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (1977), it is this Eudorus, who is behind the Middle Platonism of Philo, Clement of Alexandria and Origenes.

Sinnige then shows that the same concept of the soul's return to her origin is to be found in Basilides, Valentinus, Clement and Origenes, all inhabitants of Alexandria, where Plotinus lived for such a long time. I add that emanation and the dialectics of Self and All are also to be found in the *Hermetica*, products of the Hermetic Lodge in Alexandria: according to the *Maxims of Hermes Trismegistus to Asclepius*, preserved in Armenian, but translated from the Greek, which could easily be pre-Christian: "Who knows himself, knows the All" (IX, 4). Sinnige holds that Plotinus owes his gnostic ideas to Valentinus and current gnostic ideas in general: both Valentinus and Plotinus hold that the soul is a girl in love with her Father. I think one can be more specific. His opponents were (according to *Enneads* II, 9, (33) *Against the Gnostikoi*, a title given by Porphyrius) the *Gnostikoi*, adherents of a very special sect, which originated in Alexandria and produced there the *Apocryphon of John*, but were also present at that time in Rome and Carthage. On the other hand, certain characteristics given by Plotinus in the same writing are unmistakably Valentinian: the *principium individuationis* as hybris (*tolma*) etc. In Carthage these *Gnostikoi* had made an alliance with the Valentinians: tunc Gnostici prerumpunt, *tunc Valentiniani proserpunt* (Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 1). Were they allies in Rome too?

I have only one major criticism to make: it is not true that the concept of the identity of the human Self and the One must have been taken from the Upanishads, because it is not found in any Greek source before Plotinus. The Hermetic *Poimandres* (1st century A.D., Alexandria) is an illustration of the maxim: "let spiritual man know himself as immortal, and that *eros*

is the origin of death, then he will know everything (the All)" (13). This clearly is an amplification of the above quoted saying of Hermes Trismegistus: "who knows himself, knows the All." That is a Greek source, which is older than Plotinus.

But all this is not so very important. Sinnige has proved definitively that Plotinus was a gnostic.

NL-3722 BR *Bilthoven*, GILLES QUISPEL
Noord Houdringelaan 32

Paolo Bettiolo, Alda Giambelluca Kossova, Claudio Leonardi, Enrico Norelli, Lorenzo Perrone (eds.), *Ascensio Isaiae. Textus* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 7). Turnhout 1995, XXXI, 444 pp. Enrico Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae. Commentarius* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 8), Turnhout 1995, 722 pp.

The *Ascension of Isaiah* shares the features typical of so many apocryphal writings. Its author is unknown, its date is under dispute, it has come down to us in many languages, completely or in fragments, the original language is controversial and, last but not least, opinions are divided as to the religious milieu in which it originated: was it Jewish or Christian? The work does not suffer from a lack of editions and translations, but a comprehensive treatment of the material now at our disposal has been wanting. How should one tackle the task of presenting it? Admittedly, the best procedure would be for a single scholar combining the qualities of a philologist and a polyglot to work on it. Since, however, that sort is scarce, in the volumes under review the second best solution of teamwork has been chosen. Work was begun in 1978 on the initiative of Professor Mauro Pesce of Bologna (I p. v), the team's composition underwent some changes in the course of time, interim results appeared in print, and now we have the final work before us. As is usual with the Series Apocryphorum, there are two volumes; the former one presents the texts with their translations, the latter offers a commentary and the indexes. The project was supervised by Enrico Norelli, who wrote the Acknowledgement and Preface to the first volume, made a number of contributions to it and composed the commentary in volume two. All of the contributions except the edition and the synopsis are in Italian, the native language, we may suppose, of all but one of the contributors. Let us have a look at each of the volumes.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

The first volume contains critical editions with introductions and facing translations of the *Ascension of Isaiah* in Ethiopic (text Perrone, translation Norelli), Greek (Norelli), Coptic (Bettiolo), Latin (Leonardi), Old Bulgarian (Giambelluca Kossova) and of the *Greek Legend of Isaiah* (Norelli). A Latin synopsis by Norelli of all of the texts except the *Legend* concludes the volume. If we compare the new edition with the one by R.H. Charles, London 1900, we find, first of all, that it uses a number of hitherto unknown witnesses to the text. For the Ethiopic (Ge'ez) version, the only one to offer a complete text, nine manuscripts have been used (Charles: three). The Slavonic version, which comprises chs. 6-11, has been made from seven manuscripts (the translation by G.N. Bonwetsch in Charles was based on two). The Coptic fragments, which were still unknown to Charles and were published by L.Th. Lefort and P. Lacau, have been revised using the papers of Lacau. The Latin texts, fragments of *Vat. Lat.* 5750 from chs. 2-3 and 7-8 and a translation of chs. 6-11 extant in an edition from 1522 have been collated afresh. The Greek papyrus texts originally edited by Grenfell and Hunt could be improved in some instances. Finally, the *Greek Legend*, a Byzantine text rewriting the *Ascension* (BHG 958; CANT 316), could be edited on the basis of two manuscripts (up to now, only one was known). As far as this reviewer is able to judge, the editions have been prepared with great competence. No uniformity has been reached in the style of the critical apparatuses; this is the price one has to pay for the collaborating of scholars working in different fields. The translations are provided with an apparatus of biblical quotations and allusions and with footnotes dealing with textual criticism. The synopsis, in which all of the texts appear in Latin, is a most welcome addition to this volume. It should be borne in mind, however, that the texts of the Latin versions in it are not identical with those of the edition, earlier in the book, by Leonardi (the latter introducing emendations, whereas the synopsis offers the text of the witnesses). A further particularity is the use of ὡς, ὅτι, τῶν, τοῦ etc. in the rendition of the Greek, Slavonic, and Ethiopic versions, to achieve a precision which Latin is unable to express. This was inspired by the translation, made as long ago as 1877, by August Dillmann (cf. I p. xii). It is a pity that in the synopsis the running heads are not used to indicate the chapter numbers. Since each chapter takes several pages, one often has to turn one or more of them to find the chapter number. The editors expressly reject the idea of reconstructing a supposedly original text (cf. I p. ix). One can only applaud their decision, for the result could be no more than an artificial text which never was in circulation. It belongs to the essence of apocryphal texts that they circulated in ever changing forms.

The second volume consists of a lengthy commentary on the *Ascension* interlarded with eleven excursuses and preceded by an introduction of some sixty pages, based on the Ethiopic text but duly taking the other versions into consideration (even though Norelli is honest about his command of Old Slavonic and Coptic, cf. I p. xi and II pp. 16 and 24). At the end come indexes of biblical passages, names (for the Ethiopic), ancient texts, themes, and manuscripts, as well as full word indexes for each of the texts edited. The introduction expounds Norelli's view of the text. It intrepidly defends a minority position. Indeed, in the words of the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, third edition, 1997, p. 850, 'it is now generally agreed that the basis is a document describing Isaiah's martyrdom, prob. Jewish in origin and perhaps originally in Hebrew or Aramaic, into which a Christian editor has inserted a Christian apocalypse (3. 13-4. 22) and also made other minor additions and adaptations.' This explains why the *Ascension* has been welcomed in collections both of Old Testament and New Testament apocrypha. Norelli, while accepting the composite character of the work, feels it to be Christian in origin and written in Greek by a group of early Christian prophets; chs. 6-11, he argues, is the oldest part and chs. 1-5 are an addition dating from the beginning of the second century that has never had an independent existence. He rightly points to the fact that the Christians could quite well use Old Testament subject matter. As for the Jewish traditions in the work, he assumes a close relation of the group producing this text with Jewish circles interested in mysticism (cf. II p. 55). Pride of place has been assigned to the commentary. It offers broad, though learned expositions; those looking it up for quick information on a detail have to exercise patience. It should be pointed out, however, that the publishing house has issued a pocket volume resuming the results of the present work: *Ascension du prophète Isaïe. Traduction, introduction et notes* (Apocryphes. Collection de poche de l'AELAC 2), Turnhout 1993, likewise by E. Norelli. If this is not meant to inform about minor points, it offers at least a surveyable summary of results. In this context, furthermore, mention should be made of Norelli's *L'Ascensione di Isaia. Studi su un apocrifo al crocevia dei cristianesimi* (Origini N.S. 1), Bologna 1994, which serves as a companion to the commentary (cf. I p. xiv).

The preparation of the volumes has been done with great care, and the small mistakes (for L. Th. LEFORT vol. 2, p. 151 n. 5 read P. GRELOT; errors in the Greek, especially in volume 2, include ἔσχη p. 117, ἐλθέναι p. 147, ἐώρᾳ p. 345; five errors in succession on p. 541 παραδώσεως ὁρμώμενοι βίβλους νἱοὺς πρωτέρας) cannot detract from the final judgement which is that we have here a splendid presentation of the texts, an

indispensible tool in future studies on the *Ascension of Isaiah*. There is only one 'but' in the matter: the price of the volumes, 7500 + 9250 BEF in hardback, 7000 + 8750 BEF in paperback, will force the average scholar, like the merchant of pearls in the Gospel, to sell everything he owns in order to buy them.

9712 JC *Groningen*, Hofstraat 34 A. HILHORST

BOOKS RECEIVED

Assmann, Jan & Guy G. Stroumsa, *Transformation of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (Numen Book Series 83), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1999, vii + 437 pp., ISBN 90-04-11356-8, DFL 155/US $ 91.50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Avite de Vienne, *Histoire spirituelle.* I: Chants I-III. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Nicole Hecquet-Noti (Sources Chrétiennes 444), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1999, 334 p., ISBN 2-204-06321-5, FF 173 (broché).

Bienert, W.A. & U. Kühneweg (Hrsg.), *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters 1999, xxv + 848 S., ISBN 90-429-0680-4, BEF 3800/EUR 95 (pb).—An impressive volume with 58 contributions on Origen, mainly being the result of the 1997 Marburg conference. Edited by Wolfgang Bienert and Uwe Kühneweg in an exemplary way.

Bingham, D. Jeffrey, *Irenaeus' Use of Matthew's Gospel in Adversus Haereses* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 7), Leuven: Peeters 1998, XV + 357 pp., ISBN 90-6831-964-7, BEF 2400/EUR 60 (cloth with book jacket).

Brune, Karl-Heinz, *Der koptische Reiter: Jäger, König, Heiliger. Ikonographische und stilistische Untersuchung zur den Reiterdarstellungen im spätantiken Ägypten und die Frage ihres 'Volkskunstcharakters'* (Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 11), Altenberge: Oros Verlag 1999, 400 S. + 50 S. Abbildungen, ISBN 3-89375-182-3, DM 96,– (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).

Buschmann, Gerd, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 6), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1998, 452 S. + 1 Faltplan, ISBN 3-525-51681-9, DM 158,– (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).

Charlesworth, James H., Carol A. Newsom *et al.*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Volume 4B: *Angelic Liturgies: Songs of the Sabbath Service*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press 1999, xxiii + 196 pp., ISBN 3-16-146914-3, DM 148,– (Leinen).—Superb edition of these Songs from Qumran which have important parallels in Early Christian Literature.

Charlesworth, James H., Hermann Lichtenberger, Gerbern S. Oegema, *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1998, XII + 345 S., ISBN 3-16-146968-2, DM 150/ÖS 1090/SFr 130 (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).—This impressive volume (12 contributions, by Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, Oegema, Dexinger, Collins, Evans, Zimmermann, and Abegg) provides much more than its title promises: a treatment of diverse Messianic ideas not only in the Dead See Scrolls, but in e.g. the Biblical Pseudepigrapha as well. With an extensive 'Bibliography of Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls' (204-214).

Clark, Elizabeth A., *Reading Renunciation. Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1999, xv + 420 pp., ISBN 0-691-00512-5, $ 21.95/£ 13.95 (pb).—First paperback edition of an impressive study of how asceticism was promoted through Biblical interpretation.

Coyle, J. Kevin & Steven C. Muir, *Healing in Religion and Society from Hippocrates to the Puritans. Selected Studies* (Studies in Religion and Society 43), Lewiston etc.: The Edwin Mellen Press 1999, viii + 190 pp., ISBN 0-7734-8145-1, $ 89.95 (cloth).—Six essays originally presented to the 'Early Christianity Group' of several of Ottawa's higher institutions of learning, *inter alia* 'Patristic Reception of a Lukan Healing Account' (= Lk 14,1-24; L. Gregory Bloomquist) and 'Healing and the "Physician" in Manichaeism' (J. Kevin Coyle).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2000

Davies, Jon, *Death, Burial and Rebirth in the Religions of Antiquity*, London & New York: Routledge 1999, xiii + 246 pp. + 14 b/w plates, ISBN 0-415-12991-5, £ 16.99 (pb).

Drobner, Hubertus R., *Augustinus von Hippo: Sermones ad populum. Überlieferung und Bestand, Bibliographie, Indices* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xlix), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xx + 226 pp., ISBN 90-04-11451-3, DFL 160,–/US $ 94,– (clothbound with book jacket).

Edwards, Mark, Martin Goodman and Simon Price (edd.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999, x + 315 pp., ISBN 0-19-826986-2, £ 48.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Fiedrowicz, Michael, *Prinzipien der Schriftauslegung in der Alten Kirche* (Traditio christiana 10), Bern etc.: Peter Lang 1998, xli + 203 S., ISBN 3-906760-70-7, SFr 98,– (Geb.).—Im selben Verlag erschien gleichzeitig eine Französische Ausgabe (*Principes de l'interprétation de l'Écriture dans l'Église ancienne*) dieser wichtigen Fundgrube: Einführung, (Griechische und Lateinische) Texte und Übersetzungen (mit Erläuterungen) von Clemens Romanus bis Gregorius Magnus. Mit ausgezeichnetem Register.

Fine, Steven, *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, London & New York: Routledge 1999, xviii + 253 pp. (incl. 2 maps and several b/w ill.), ISBN 0-415-18247-6, £ 50.00 (cloth with book jacket).—A well-designed and well-edited book that brings together thirteen essays by leading authorities in the field: E.P. Sanders, Common Judaism and the synagogue in the first century; P.W. van der Horst, Was the synagogue a place of sabbath worship before 70 CE?; L.H. Schiffman, The early history of public reading of the Torah; S.S. Millar, The Rabbis and the non-existent monolithic synagogue; J.M. Baumgarten, Art in the synagogue: some Talmudic views; L.I. Levine, The Patriarchate and the ancient synogogue; M.D. Swartz, Sage, priest, and poet: typologies of religious leadership in the ancient synagogue; R. Pummer, Samaritan synagogues and Jewish synagogues: similarities and differences; T. Rajak, The synagogue within the Greco-Roman city; R.M. Jensen, The Dura Europos synagogue, early-Christian art, and religious life in Dura Europos; J.S. Crawford, Jews, Christians, and polytheists in late-antique Sardis; E.M. Meyers, The Torah Shrine in the ancient synagogue: another look at the evidence; S. Fine, Non-Jews in the synagogues of late-antique Palestine: Rabbinic and archeological evidence. Index.

Fitschen, Klaus, *Messalianismus und Antimessalianismus. Ein Beispiel ostkirchlicher Ketzergeschichte* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 71), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1998, 379 S., ISBN 3-525-55179-7, DM 148,– (Geb.).

Goehring, James E., *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert*, Harrisburg PA: Trinity Press International 1999, xxxii + 287 pp., ISBN 1-56338-269-5, $ 29.00 (pb).—Twelve important essays (most of them previously published, all of them edited to fit the present volume) on Early Egyptian Christianity. With extensive introduction, bibliography, and index. Foreword by Birger Pearson.

Grant, Robert M., *Early Christians and Animals*, London & New York: Routledge 1999, ix + 214 pp. (incl. 22 b/w plates), ISBN 0-415-20204-3, £ 45.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Gregorius Palamas: *Saint Gregory Palamas, Dialogue between an Orthodox and a Barlaamite.* Translation by Rein Ferwerda, introduction by Sara J. Denning-Bolle, Global Publications etc.: Binghamton, New York 1999, 108 pp., ISBN 1-883058-21-X, $ 17.00 (pb).

Greschat, Katharina, *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xlviii), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xii + 350 pp., ISBN 90-04-11549-8, DFL 200,–/US $ 117,75 (clothbound with book jacket).

Hannah, Darrell D., *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2. Reihe 109), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, xv + 289 S., ISBN 3-16-147054-0, DM 98,– (kart.).—Extensive discussion of Michael traditions in the Jewish

Literature of the Second Temple Period and, in particular, of Michael traditions and 'angel[ic] Christology' in the Early Christian Literature: the New Testament documents and the Christian writings from the second and third centuries like Ps.-Cyprian, *De centesima*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Pseudo-Clementines*, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus.

Hansen, G.C.: *Dissertationes criticae. Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen.* Hrsg. von Chr.-Fr. Collatz, J. Dümmer, J. Kollesch, M.-L. Werlitz, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 1998, xiii + 569 S., ISBN 3-8260-1496-0 (pb).—Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag des bekannten klassischen Philologen und Patristikers. Mit Verzeichnis der Veröffentlichungen des Jubilars (S. 539-545). Beiträgen von u.a. G. Strecker (Sophia-Tradition in der Theologie des Paulus, 323-332); P. Habermehl (Das älteste Zeugnis für die apokryphen Paulusakten, 333-340); M. Morani (La tradizione manoscritta del *De caelesti hierarchia* dello Pseudo-Dionigi e la versione armena, 341-351); W. Ullmann (Logos und Sophia in der Trinitätslehre des Origenes, 353-365); M. Zelzer (*Meus est praeceptor Ambrosius.* Aug., *C. Iul. op. imp.* 6,21, 367-375); A.A. Mosshammer (Roman History according to George the Syncellus, 377-393).

Harland, Peter J. & Robert Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth. Prophecy and the Millennium* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 77), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1999, xii + 332 pp., ISBN 90-04-10841-6, DFL 160/US $ 94.50 (clothbound with book jacket).—Nineteen essays in honour of Anthony Gelston, well-known among Patristic scholars for, in particular, his 1992-edition, with English translation and commentary, of the Syriac Liturgy of Addai and Mari.

Heil, Utha, *Athanasius von Alexandrien, De sententia Dionysii. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Patristische Texten und Studien 52), Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1999, IX + 344 S., ISBN 3-11-016520-1, DM 208,– (Leinen).

Hilaire de Poitiers, *La Trinité.* I: Livres I-III. Texte critique par P. Smulders (CCL). Introduction par M. Figura et J. Doignon (†). Traduction par G.M. de Durand (†), Ch. Morel et G. Pelland. Notes par G. Pelland (Sources Chrétiennes 443), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1999, 396 p., ISBN 2-204-06232-4, FF 205 (broché).

Hirschberg, Peter, *Das eschatologische Israel. Untersuchungen zum Gottesvolkverständnis der Johannesoffenbarung*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1999, X + 340 S., ISBN 3-7887-1750-5, DM 98/ÖS 715/SFr 80 (Geb.).

Keizer, Heleen M., *Life Time Entirety. A Study of AIΩN in Greek Literature and Philosophy, the Septuagint and Philo*, Ph. Diss. Amsterdam University (promotores J.M. Bremer & D.T. Runia) 1999, [obtainable from the author: Ceintuurbaan 175, NL-1073 EJ Amsterdam], ix + 300 pp. (pb).

Külzer, Andreas, *Disputationes Graecae Contra Iudaeos. Untersuchungen zur Byzantinischen antijüdischen Dialogliteratur und ihrem Judenbild* (Byzantinisches Archiv 18), Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner 1999, xvii + 400 S., ISBN 3-519-07741-8, DM 168/ÖS 1226/SFr 151 (Leinen).

Lane, Anthony N.S., *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1999, xiii + 304 pp., ISBN 0-567-08694-1, £ 16.95 (pb).—A meticulous and, as regards the results of other researchers, a sometimes rather too scrutinous investigation into Calvin's knowledge and use of the Fathers (incl. Bernardus). With extensive bibliography and indices.

Lienhard, Joseph T., *Contra Marcellum. Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 1999, xviii + 280 pp., ISBN 0-8132-0901-3, $ 59.95 (cloth).—In this well-designed and beautifully printed book, the so-called Arian controversy of the fourth century is studied from one well-defined angle: Marcellus of Ancyra and his influence.

Lubac, Henri de, *Typologie—Allegorie—Geistiger Sinn. Studien zur Geschichte der christlichen Schriftauslegung* (Theologia Romanica 23), Freiburg: Johannes Verlag Einsiedeln 1999,

XIX + 492 S., ISBN 3-89411-357-X, DM 68,– (Geb.).—Deutsche übertragung von De Lubacs *L'Écriture dans la tradition* (1966) und von wichtigen Teilen seiner *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatres sens de l'Écriture* (1959-1964) und *Théologies d'occasion* (1984). Übersetzung (mit wertvollen Erläuterungen) und Einleitung von dem Spezialisten Rudolph Voderholzer, dessen Münchener Dissertation *Die Einheit der Schrift und ihr geistiger Sinn. Der Beitrag Henri de Lubacs zur Erforschung von Geschichte und Systematik christlicher Bibelhermeneutik* 1998 vom Johannes Verlag publiziert wurde.

Luisier, Philippe, *Les citations vétéro-testamentaires dans les versions coptes des Évangiles. Recueil et analyse critique* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme XXII), Genève: Patrick Cramer Éditeur [13, rue de Chantepoulet] 1998, 276 p. (relié).—Thèse de doctorat à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Genève (directeur de thèse: R. Kasser).

Martinez, David G., *Baptized for Our Sakes: A Leather Trishagion from Egypt (P. Mich. 799). Edition and Commentary*, (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 120; P. Michigan XIX), Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner 1999, xi + 115 pp. (+ separate photo), ISBN 3-519-07669-1, DM 58/ÖS 423/SFr 52 (Leinen).—Edition of a c. seventh-century Christian hymn, 'one of the most extensive and important Greek liturgical documents to emerge from Egypt in recent years'.

McGowan, Andrew, *Ascetic Eucharists. Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1999, xiii + 312 pp., ISBN 0-19-826972-2, £ 48.00 (cloth with book jacket).

McLeod, Frederick G., *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 1999, xi + 276 pp., ISBN 0-8132-0930-7, $ 61.95 (cloth).—A well-designed classic book presenting the Antiochene understanding (Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Nestorius, and Theodoretus) of how humans are the image of God.

Mgaloblishvili, Tamila (ed.), *Ancient Christianity in the Caucasus* (Iberica Caucasica 1), Richmond, Surrey UK: Curzon Press 1998, xvi + 272 pp., ISBN 0-7007-0633-X (cloth).

Müller, Hildegrund, *Eine Psalmenpredigt über die Auferstehung. Augustinus, Enarratio in Psalmum 65. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Österr. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Klasse 653), Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 1997, 138 S., ISBN 3-7001-27000-6, ÖS 480/DM 65/CHF 59 (brosch.).

Nagel, Peter, *Der Tractatus Tripartitus aus Nag Hammadi Codex I (Codex Jung)* (Studien und Texten zu Antike und Christentum 1), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1998, VII + 120 S., ISBN 3-16-147033-8, DM 59,– (kart.).—Neuübersetzung des *Tractatus Tripartitus* (NHC I,5), mit ausführlicher Einleitung und wichtigen Erläuterungen.

Old, Hughes Oliphant, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, 1: The Biblical Period; 2: The Patristic Age; 3: The Medieval Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans 1998/1998/1999, x + 383 pp./viii + 481 pp./xviii + 646 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4356-5/0-8028-4357-3/0-8028-4619-X, $ 35.00/$ 42.00/$ 45.00 (pb).—Three volumes of an impressive history of the reading and preaching of the Scriptures in the Christian Church. Ch. III of Vol. I focuses on the second and third centuries (from the Didache to Origen); Vol. II deals with patristic preaching from Cyril of Jerusalem to Gregory the Great. A remarkable enterprise.

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres*. II: Homélies XI-XIX. Texte latin de W.A. Baehrens (GCS). Nouvelle édition par L. Doutreleau (Sources Chrétiennes 442), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1999, 417 p., ISBN 2-204-06227-8, FF 232 (broché).

Pazzini, Domenico, *Il prologo di Giovanni in Cirillo di Alessandria* (Studi Biblici 116), Brescia: Paideia Editrice 1997, 217 pp., ISBN 88-394-0548-8, L 33.000 (pb).

Pillinger, R., V. Popova, B. Zimmermann (Red.), *Corpus der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Wandmalereien Bulgariens* (Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Antiquarische Abteilung 21),

Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 1999, 107 S. + 79 Tafeln (214 Abbildungen, davon 99 Farbabb.) + 1 Faltplan, ISBN 3-7001-2778-2, ÖS 990/DM 136/CHF 121 (brosch.).

Runia, David T. (ed.), *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Vol. X, 1998 (Brown Judaic Studies 319), Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 1998, viii + 212 pp., ISBN 0-7885-0508-4, $ 29.95 (cloth).—F. Siegert, The Philonian Fragment *De Deo*. First English Translation (1-33); A. Kamesar, Philo, the Presence of 'Paideutic' Myth in the Pentateuch, and the 'Principles' or *Kephalaia* of Mosaic Discourse (34-65); A.P. Bos, Philo of Alexandria: A Platonist in the Image and Likeness of Aristotle (66-86); H. Szesnat, 'Pretty Boys' in Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* (87-107); E. Osborn, Philo and Clement: Quiet Conversion and Noetic Exegesis (108-124); A. Pawlaczyk, Philo in Poland since the Second World War (125-130); D.T. Runia, A New Philo Word Index (131-134). Bibliography (135-175). Reviews (176-202).

Speyer, Wolfgang, *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld* (WUNT 116), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, X + 303 S., ISBN 3-16-147051-6, DM 168,– (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).—Zweite Sammlung 'Kleine Schriften' mit Einleitung ('Die Grundlagen des geistigen Europa in den Religionen und Kulturen der alten Mittelmeervölker und im jüdisch-christlichen Offenbarungsglauben') und 'Nachträge'.

Stroumsa, Guy G., *Barbarian Philosophy. The Religious Revolution of Early Christianity* (WUNT 112), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, XII + 345 S., ISBN 3-16-147105-9, DM 178/ÖS 1299/SFr 152 (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).

Strutwolf, Holger, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 72), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1999, 469 S., ISBN 3-525-55180-0, DM 148,– (Geb.).

Studer, Basil, *Mysterium caritatis. Studien zur Exegese und zur Trinitätslehre in der Alten Kirche* (Studia Anselmiana 127), Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 479 pp., ISBN 88-8139-087-6, Lit. 100.000 (pb).

Ulrich, Eugene, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans/Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1999, xviii + 309 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4611-4, $ 25.00 (pb).—Collection of fourteen essays, e.g., 'Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint in the Third Century C.E.'; 'The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran'; 'Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint'.

Weidmann, Frederick W., *Polycarp and John. The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Traditions* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 12), Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press 1999, xvi + 189 pp., ISBN 0-268-03851-1, $ 35,– (cloth).

Wellstein, Matthias, *Nova Verba in Tertullians Schriften gegen die Häretiker aus montanistischer Zeit* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 127), Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner 1999, 351 S., ISBN 3-519-07676-4, DM 128/ÖS 934/SFr 115 (Leinen).

Williams, Michael Allen, *Rethinking 'Gnosticism'. An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1999, xix + 335 pp., ISBN 0-691-00542-7, $ 19.95/£ 11.95 (pb).—First paperback edition of a both challenging and epoch-making book (1996) in the field of gnostic studies.

Zachhuber, Johannes, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa. Philosophical Background and Theological Significance* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xlvi), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xii + 271 pp., ISBN 90-04-11530-7, DFL 150,–/US $ 88,25 (clothbound with book jacket).

READING PSALM 4 TO THE MANICHEANS

BY

ANNEMARÉ KOTZÉ

This article is joining a number of voices that have been going up in recent years, pointing to the (anti-)Manichean content and purpose of Augustine's *Confessions*.[1] It is specific and limited in scope, looking only at one short passage (*Conf.* IX.4.8-11) for the attitude towards the Manicheans it reveals, but it also suggests reasons why particularly this aspect of this passage might be important for our understanding of the *Confessions* as a whole.

That Augustine's account of his reading of Ps. 4 (*Conf.* IX.4.8-11) was something unparalleled in ancient literature has been pointed out by O'Donnell and affirmed by Stock.[2] That the *Confessions* are at least partly anti-Manichean in content is a fact that is widely known and is receiving more attention in the wake of the discovery of and heightened interest in Manichean documents.[3] This knowledge however does not prepare the reader for the strong positive emotion towards the Manicheans revealed

---

[1] More specifically, this article is an elaboration on the remarks made on *Conf.* IX (246-247) by J. van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism in Augustine's *Confessiones, Manichaean Studies III, Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"* (1997) 235-247. For the importance of taking into account Manichean issues when interpreting the *Confessions*, see also e.g. J. van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47 (1993) 276-291; D. Chidester, The symmetry of word and light: perceptual categories in Augustine's Confessions, *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986) 119-133. Although this line of study has been pursued by some scholars for quite a few years now, it has not yet become part of the main stream research on the *Confessions*. James J. O'Donell's excellent introduction in his *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1992), refers to this line of research only implicitly and in passing, vol. 1, xvii-li.

[2] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 91 (above n. 1); Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996).

[3] For an overview of the work on Manichean texts see J. Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les manichéens, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 9 (1963) 201-215 and Johannes van Oort, *Mani, Manichaesim and Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi 1996) 7-24 and 39, note 1. Van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism (above n. 1) also shows that a lot of work still has to be done in this field.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

in the meditation on Ps. 4 in *Confessions* IX.4.8-11. A preoccupation with the Manicheans permeates the passage, both in terms of implicit references to issues important in Augustine's debate with them and in terms of explicit remarks. The hypotheses to be examined in this article, are the following: the Manicheans are signified as the most important (if not sole) intended audience of the passage;[4] Augustine is here not "renounc[ing] his former coreligionists"[5] but appealing to them in a strongly protreptic passage to turn away from their erroneous ways.[6]

Two factors pointed out by O'Donnell add significance to any effort to understand this passage. First, IX.4 is situated very near to the exact midpoint of the *Confessions*. Second, the structure of Ps. 4, which governs the structure of this passage, mirrors the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole.[7] A fuller examination of these aspects falls outside the scope of the present article. The main emphasis here is on the following points: 1) explicit references to the intended audience; 2) devices used to persuade the Manicheans, namely a) identification with the audience and b) the employment of terminology derived from Manichean texts and liturgy. It is of course not always possible to keep these categories apart and discussions often overlap.

The Manicheans as readers of the Confessions and of the Old Testament

At this point there are two issues that have to be considered. First, can we assume that the Manicheans would read the *Confessions*? Courcelle seems to believe that they did and that Secundinus, a prominent Manichean *audi-*

---

[4] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 98 (above n. 1) also refers to the Manicheans as "the express targets of the exegesis."

[5] Van Oort uses this phrase to describe other passages in the *Confessions*, Van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism 245 (above n. 1).

[6] Erich Feldmann, Confessiones. In *Augustinus-Lexicon*, eds. C. Mayer *et al.* (Basel 1994) 1134-1193, holds the view that the *Confessions* as a whole is a protreptikos, "in der A. seine Biographie instrumentalisiert, um mit ihr die Leser aufzuwecken," 1167. The degree to which the form and content of the *Confessions* display characteristics of the προτρεπτικὸς λόγος, is a question which needs further investigation. For the present purposes Berger's summary of the contents of Clemens of Alexandria's Protreptikos illustrates the way in which the term protreptic is used here: "Hier geht es um die Darstellung der Vortrefflichkeit der christlichen Religion gegenüber anderen Wegen: Die christliche Kirche bringt die Wahrheit, die anderen dagegen leere Mythen, Irrtum und Verderben. Der christliche Weg wird als der wahre vorgestellt," Klaus Berger, Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II*, 25.2 (Berlin 1984).

[7] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 3 91 (above n. 1).

tor, alludes to the *Confessions* in a letter to Augustine.[8] I argue however, that the strongest evidence for this possibility is internal evidence.

Then there is a problem surrounding Augustine's use of an Old Testament text to base a protreptic to the Manicheans on, while we know that they rejected the entire Old Testament (together with parts of the New Testament).[9] But if Augustine can illustrate that the meaning and the message of the psalm is echoed and reinforced by quotations from the New Testament, especially from books we know that the Manicheans were fond of quoting themselves, its message should appear more valid, even to them. Where in *Confessions* IX.4.8 the quotations are from the Psalms (Ps. 4 and other psalms), in the next three sections, that bear the weight of the argument, quotations from the New Testament (and especially from the books of Paul, "the apostle of the Manichees"[10]) abound. It is also significant for our evaluation of the importance of this passage for our reading of the *Confessions* as a whole, to note the dense texture created here by the abundance of scriptural quotations. This is an instance of what Knauer refers to as *Zitatennester*, a phenomenon which he asserts occurs at important or pivotal passages in the *Confessions*.[11]

The Manicheans as the intended audience of Augustine's meditation on Psalm 4

Augustine's remarks here make it impossible to misread the fact that he intended the Manicheans as the most important secondary audience for his meditations on Ps. 4, which are of course formally addressed to God. IX.4.8 quotes Ps. 4:2 and is a kind of prologue with the main function of

---

[8] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris 1968) 236-237.

[9] In IX.4.11 there is an explicit reference to the Manicheans' resistance to (large parts of) Scripture: *super inimicis scripturae huius tabescebam* (The context makes clear that they are the enemies referred to). On the Manicheans' use of Scripture, see also e.g. Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme 281 (above n. 1); C. P. Bammel, Pauline exegesis, Manicheism and philosophy in the early Augustine. In *Christian faith and Greek philosophy in late antiquity. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1993) 1-25; G. Wenning, Der Einfluss des Manichäismus und des Ambrosius auf die Hermeneutik Augustins, *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 36 (1990) 80-89; Alberto Viciano, Aspects christologiques du "Corpus Paulinum" dans la Controverse antimanichéenne de Saint Augustin, in *Manichean Studies* I (1991) 379-389 and Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin (above n. 3). O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 1 xlix (above n. 1), also asserts "Everything exegetical in A. down to 400 at least must be taken as having an anti-Manichean sub-text."

[10] Bammel, "Pauline exegesis," 1 (above n. 9).

[11] G. N. Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen 1955) 114-117. He does not analyse *Confessions* IX.4.8-11 in any depth.

setting up the dramatic situation and indicating the intended audience.[12] After stating that he would want the whole world to hear him recite the psalm, Augustine's focus narrows down to the Manicheans: *quam vehementi et acri dolore indignabar manichaeis*,[13] which is translated by Chadwick as "What vehement and bitter anger I felt against the Manichees!"[14] Read like this, there is no trace of the positive emotion towards the Manicheans that I have mentioned. It is difficult to give a better rendition of this sentence but an examination of the Latin should verify that this translation over emphasizes the element of anger while the idea of pain and sorrow, inherent in *vehementi et acri dolore*, is not given enough prominence.

This view is validated by the references to pity, sickness and healing in the following phrases: *miserabar eos rursus, quod illa sacramenta, illa medicamenta nescirent et insani*[15] *essent adversus antidotum quo sani esse potuissent!* ("Also, I pitied them because they did not know those sacraments, those medicines. And they raged insanely against the antidote through which they could have become sane").[16] The imagery of the healer caring for sick or injured humanity was well known to the Manicheans. It is developed extensively in one of their Bêma-psalms,[17] and might have held mostly positive connotations for them.[18] Again, this makes the tone urgent and caring rather than sharp or accusatory.[19]

---

[12] See the analysis of the structure of the Psalm (in which he sees a reflection of the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole) by O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 3 91 (above n. 1).

[13] All citations are from O'Donnell's text in *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 1 (above n. 1).

[14] *Saint Augustine. Confessions*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Henry Chadwick (Oxford 1991) 160.

[15] References to madness have become synonymous with the Manicheans in *Confessions* I-VIII and the tone is usually derogatory. But in this context (with its references to the opposite *sani* and to *antidotum*) the emphasis is on sickness and the need for healing.

[16] The translations given here are my own, a "working translation," designed only to meet the needs of the present article. I acknowledge, however, my debt to all translations that I have read.

[17] Bêma Psalm 241, discussed by Julien Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 22 (1976) 218-233, 226.

[18] Of course Augustine's usual negative use of *insani* is also evoked here (playing on the name of Mani/Manes, which meant demented, Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 9 (above n. 3)).

[19] Gibb and Montgomery's introduction (xxxii-xxxiii) also refers to "a gentleness and an elevation, rare in the theological controversies of Christian antiquity," which is at times discernible in Augustine's language because '[h]e felt that having been himself a member of the sect, it became him to deal tenderly with those who had gone astray

The following lines of IX.4.8 are the most explicit indication that Augustine wants specifically the Manicheans to know how Ps. 4 affected him, and ultimately how it should affect them: *vellem ut alicubi iuxta essent tunc et, me nesciente quod ibi essent, intuerentur faciem meam et audirent voces meas, quando legi quartum psalmum . . . quid de me fecerit ille psalmus* ("I would have liked them to have been somewhere nearby then and to have observed my face and heard my cries when I read that fourth psalm, without me knowing that they were there, and to have seen what effect that psalm had on me"). The subject of *essent* can only be the same as that of the main verbs of the last part of the previous sentence, the Manicheans. It is the Manicheans Augustine wishes could be listening and looking on and not any other group or even the whole world as a cursory glance at the beginning of the passage might have seemed to indicate. Moreover, he assumes that if they could in some way hear and see his emotional reaction without him knowing that they were there, they would be convinced of the sincerity of his emotions and not assume that he is staging an act for their benefit: *ne me propter se illa dicere putarent quae inter haec verba dixerim* ("so that they would not think that I was saying the words I said in between the words of the psalm for their sake"). Why would Augustine wish this if not in the hope that his reactions would touch the Manicheans in a manner that he has been unable to achieve up to now and make them turn away from their wrong way and towards his right way? If this is so the function of the passage can be characterized as protreptic.

The last section of IX.4.8 contains the quotation of the first words of the psalm[20] and sets up an interesting dramatic situation for the meditation that follows. Augustine's words here are, like the rest of the *Confessions*, addressed to God and at least formally presented as a private conversation without an audience. The Manicheans are not present at Cassiciacum as he would have wished them to be. So, the reactions portrayed are to be taken as just as genuine as they would be in such an intimate situation: Augustine alone before his God (as is expressed poignantly by the vocative, *pater*, at the beginning of IX.4.9). Thus, the problems of inhibi-

---

after the same fashion," John Gibb and William Montgomery eds., *The Confessions of Augustine* (Cambridge 1927).

[20] I will refer to this procedure as quotation although very often it is more a question of Augustine intertwining the words of the psalm into his own stream of consciousness, e.g. by changing verbs to the first person to pertain to himself or by changing imperatives to past tense indicatives to indicate how the psalm has had its effect on him. See O'Donnell *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. I lxi (above n. 1).

tions on both sides no longer exist: *re vera nec ea dicerem nec sic ea dicerem, si me ab eis audiri viderique sentirem, nec, si dicerem, sic acciperent, quomodo mecum et mihi coram te de familiari affectu animi mei* ("And it is true that I would not have said those things and would not have said them in the same way, if I had known that I was heard and seen by them. And if I had said them, they would not have accepted them in the way I meant them when I was speaking by myself and to myself in your presence and motivated by the intimate love for you in my heart").

We are then supposed to assume that the opposite applies: the (Manichean) reader "sees" and "hears" Augustine's uninhibited reactions, not an act designed with the ulterior motive of influencing him or her. This also means that, should a Manichean now read the *Confessions*, he must be affected by this passage in just the way Augustine had hoped he would be if his presence that day had gone undetected. This would of course meet exactly the ultimate objective of the master of rhetoric and is another argument for claiming that the passage has a protreptic intent.

Apart from the lines discussed above, there are two more explicit references to the intended audience of the meditation. The first is midway through, at the end of IX.4.9: *quae utinam audissent qui adhuc usque diligunt vanitatem et quaerunt mendacium*: ("Oh, if only they could have heard me, they who still up to this day love emptiness and seek lies"). The reader knows that the group consistently associated with emptiness and lies up to this point in the *Confessions* are the Manicheans.

The next and last (almost) explicit reference to the intended audience of Augustine's exegesis of Ps. 4 calls them deaf corpses and enemies of Scripture. But the context once again softens the impact of these accusations because Augustine says in IX.4.11, *legebam, et ardebam nec inveniebam quid facerem surdis mortuis ex quibus fueram* ("I was reading and I was burning but I could not find anything I could do about these deaf corpses of whom I had been one"[21]). What he wants to communicate here is not invective against the Manicheans but the urgency of his effort to reach them and his utmost frustration with the lack of success up to now.[22] The

[21] I borrowed the translation "deaf corpses" from Pine-Coffin because I cannot translate the phrase any better, *Saint Augustine: Confessions*. Translated with an introduction by R. S. Pine-Coffin (London 1961).

[22] See Chidester's remarks in The symmetry of word and light (above n. 1) on the themes of deafness and blindness that are developed throughout the *Confessions* and are presented *inter alia* as the symptoms Augustine had to be healed from before he could be converted.

last main clause expresses again how strongly the Manicheans' attitude influences Augustine emotionally, almost physically even: *et super inimicis scripturae huius tabescebam* ("and [now] I was feeling sick over the enemies of Scripture").

What was it that the Manicheans would have heard and seen, if they had been present? Although O'Donnell hesitates to deduce that Augustine's remarks here imply reading aloud,[23] I think the dramatic situation requires that he recite the words of the psalm out loud. Or, it would be more correct to say that he interspersed his reading of the psalm with his thoughts on the text, incorporating the words from Scripture with his own.[24] But apart from this there are numerous references to emotional cries and changes to Augustine's outward appearance in the passage.[25]

It is clear already that Augustine's intended audience here are very specifically people still adhering to Manichean doctrines, but also that simply to describe the passage as anti-Manichean would fall short of the truth. The attack on Manichean doctrine here takes secondary importance. The choice of words and the tone of the passage show that the main emphasis is on the concerned effort of a friend who cares deeply for the people he is trying to turn towards the right path. If Brown's remarks on the importance of friendship for Augustine are true, there may well have been many that were adherents of the enemy doctrine but nevertheless still Augustine's friends. He might in fact have felt responsible for them because he himself had led many of them into Manicheism.[26]

But the Manicheans are also the intended audience of Ps. 4. One of the most striking features of Augustine's meditation on this psalm is that he "discovers" there that the prophet (i.e. David) is specifically addressing the Manicheans (which is different from Augustine addressing them). When

---

[23] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 94 (above n. 1). It is interesting to note that Margaret R. Miles, *Desire and Delight. A new Reading of Augustine's Confessions* (New York 1992) 127 assumes this passage to represent "silent, private reading," while Stock, *Augustine the Reader* 112 (above n. 2), remarks on "his description of oral reading at 9.2-9.4.19."

[24] Knauer, *Psalmenzitate*, (above n. 11) remains the most coherent and full treatment of Augustine's varied techniques of citing (the psalms) from scripture.

[25] The references to his facial expression and his cries in IX.4.8, have already been mentioned. There are also in IX.4.8 *Quas . . . voces* (twice); in IX.4.9 *haec omnia exibant per oculos et vocem meam* and *insonui multa graviter ac fortiter* and in IX.4.11 *clamabam in consequenti versu clamore alto cordis mei.*

[26] In his chapter on friends Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967) 61 speaks about the "core of abiding friendships" that included many fellow-students who had followed Augustine into Manicheism.

he says in IX.4.9 *talibus dicitur qualem me fuisse reminiscebar* ("It was addressed to the kind of people of whom I remembered that I had been one"), it is clear that these people can, in the context, only be the Manicheans. The power and dramatic quality of these words become clear when they are read in the context:

> *et clamat prophetia, 'quousque graves corde? ut quid diligitis vanitatem et quaeritis mendacium? et scitote quoniam dominus magnificavit sanctum suum.' clamat 'quousque', clamat 'scitote', et ego tamdiu nesciens vanitatem dilexi et mendacium quaesivi, et ideo audivi et contremui, quoniam talibus dicitur qualem me fuisse reminiscebar. in phantasmatis enim quae pro veritate tenueram vanitas erat et mendacium.*[27]
>
> And the prophet calls out: 'how long will you harden your hearts? And why do you love emptiness and seek lies? And know that the Lord raised his Holy One to glory.' He calls 'How long?', He calls 'Know!' And for so long I did not know, and I loved emptiness and sought lies. And for this reason I heard these words and I trembled, because it was addressed to the kind of people of whom I remembered that I had been one. For in the fantastic ideas that I had clung to instead of the truth, were the emptiness and the lies.

The use of *quoniam* and *enim* in the second part of this section clearly indicates how Augustine interprets the words of the psalm as pertaining directly to the kind of errors he has associated with Manichean doctrine up to this point in the *Confessions*. The last sentence explicitly underscores this: the emptiness and lies the prophet talks about in Ps. 4 equal (Manichean) *phantasmata*.[28]

Apart from addressing the Manicheans by name and using a non-confrontational tone, there are two other important devices Augustine employs to try to convince them. Firstly, the passage seems to contain a sustained or at least a recurrent *captatio benevolentiae*, where Augustine identifies with his audience, and secondly he makes repeated use of Manichean vocabulary.[29]

---

[27] Lines 11-17 of IX.4.9 in O'Donnell's text.

[28] In *Conf.* III.6 (where Augustine's falling in with the Manicheans is described and where *phantasmata* or *phantasmatis* occurs four times) the word *phantasmata* stands for Manichean doctrine, more than any other single word or concept.

[29] See also Van Oort's remarks on this occurrence, Manichaeism and anti-Manichaeism 243 (above n. 1).

Devices used to reach out to the Manicheans

Identification with the audience

We have seen that Augustine has more than once expressed his concern, his sympathy, his urgency to reach the Manicheans. We have already referred to his use of the image of the healer caring for the sick and the serious effort expressed in the phrase *surdis mortuis*, used near the end of the meditation.

He also repeatedly identifies with his audience, castigating himself for the mistakes he has made i.e. the mistakes they are still making. In IX.4.9 for example Augustine hammers on *vanitatem et mendacium*, terms closely associated with Manichean error in the preceding books of the *Confessions*. But the intent of the passage is not invective. It is presented as a personal confession of sins: *dilexeram enim vanitatem et quaesieram mendacium . . . vanitatem dilexi et mendacium quaesivi et ideo audivi et contremui* ("For I had loved emptiness and sought lies . . . I have loved emptiness and sought lies and therefore I heard these words and I trembled"). Did Augustine tremble at the realization of how nearly he himself had been lost, or is his apprehension yet another sign of an emotional preoccupation with the wellbeing of the Manicheans?

At the end of IX.4.9 Augustine again identifies with his audience. It is phrased as a wish: *quae utinam audissent qui adhuc usque diligunt vanitatem et quaerunt mendacium* ("Oh, if only they could have heard me, they who still up to this day love emptiness and seek lies"). The key word is *usque*: The Manicheans still love emptiness and lies, but Augustine himself knows exactly what this feels like. The wish is followed by a postulation of what Augustine believes would have happened if the Manicheans had witnessed his meditation: *forte . . . evomuissent illud, et exaudires eos cum clamarent ad te* ("Perhaps they would have become upset and spewed out these lies, and You would have answered them when they called to You"). The words derive an added dimension in the light of Augustine's dramatic description of himself doing precisely this in the preceding book of the *Confessions*.

Augustine ends the meditation on Ps. 4 with a last identification with his audience in IX.4.11, *nec inveniebam quid facerem surdis mortuis ex quibus fueram* ("I could not find anything I could do about these deaf corpses of whom I had been one"). Although their attitude towards Scripture now makes him sick, he takes upon himself the shame for what he is accusing them of, *(ego) pestis latrator amarus et caecus adversus litteras* ("I had been a pestilence, barking bitterly and blindly against Scripture").

Manichean terminology

The next aspect to be examined is the striking degree to which Augustine uses Manichean terminology and the frame of reference of Manichean religious practice in order to penetrate their defenses. I will treat at some length the references to the Holy Spirit in IX.4.9 and the discussion of sin and repentance in IX.4.10. This is followed by a some remarks on Augustine's use of *lumen*, culinary imagery, phrases of calling and answering and *superbia* in IX.4.8-11.

In IX.4.9 *paracletum, spiritum veritatis* ("the paraclete, the spirit of truth") is the most important "Manichean category" used. The Manicheans saw Mani as the paraclete promised by Jesus, and the phrase "Mani, the paraclete, spirit of Truth" occurs frequently in their liturgical texts.[30] They also emphasized a trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and although this differed radically from the Christian doctrine of the trinity, they went so far as to exploit the (superficial) similarity in a deliberately propagandistic way in an effort to win over other Christians to their sect.[31]

It is significant that this is one of the few places outside his anti-Manichean works where Augustine uses the term *paracletus*, which he usually avoided *inter alia* because it was, according to O'Donnell, loaded with Manichean "claims and practices."[32] This confirms my thesis that Augustine is here consciously using loaded terms, phrases familiar to the Manicheans, perhaps because they might arrest their attention or for the benefits they might offer in terms of terminological clarity.

Here the phrase *paracletum, spiritum veritatis* occurs in a section where Augustine describes how he found in the psalm (Ps. 4:3) the words he has already used throughout the *Confessions* to describe the errors of Manichean ways:[33] *vanitatem et mendacium*.[34] These words have also been associated consistently with his own previous inability, under influence of Manichean doc-

---

[30] François E. Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit dans le système manichéen, *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993) 267-273, at 271.

[31] Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit 268 (above n. 30).

[32] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 97 (above n. 1): "A. uses paracletus rarely outside his anti-Manichean works . . . first, because it probably did not appear in his NT translations . . . and second, to avoid a word complicated by Manichean claims and practice . . ."

[33] This is what he implies. The possibility exists however that the discovery of these terms in the psalm predates his use of them in the *Confessions*.

[34] The text of the psalm used here is O'Donnell's very useful reconstruction, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 91-92 (above n. 1).

trine, to conceive of God as a spiritual being. The two-word combination is repeated no less than six times (only once changed into the nominative) in the course of IX.4.9 both before and after the phrase *paracletum, spiritum veritatis*. It is clear that Augustine sees the solution to the problem of *vanitatem et mendacium* as connected with the "Spirit of Truth."

In Psalm 4 the reference to *vanitatem et mendacium* (in verse 3) is followed by the words *et scitote quoniam magnificavit dominus sanctum suum* ("and know that the Lord has raised up his Holy One") in verse 4. This seems to evoke for Augustine the "correct" conception of what Christ was and by implication the solution to the problem of believing in emptiness and lies. He explains that he had believed in emptiness and lies because he had not known that God had done three important and related things: He had raised Christ from the dead, He had put him at his right hand and Christ had sent the Holy Spirit. The three points are not present in this form in the psalm but are evoked for Augustine by the words of verse 4 *et scitote quoniam magnificavit dominus sanctum suum*. These words he incorporates into his own, followed by the three points as an interpretative elaboration: *et tu, domine, iam magnificaveras sanctum tuum, (1) suscitans eum a mortuis et (2) collocans ad dexteram tuam, (3) unde mitteret ex alto promissionem suam, paracletum, spiritum veritatis* ("And you, o Lord, had already raised up your Holy One, (1) by raising Him from the dead and (2) placing Him at your right hand. (3) And thence, from on high he sent him he had promised, the paraclete, the spirit of truth").

What we have here are the main differences between the Christology of Catholic doctrine and that of the Manicheans.[35] Especially the emphasis on Christ's death and resurrection is meant to speak directly to the Manicheans who did not believe in the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ. This point is again present at the end of IX.4.9: *quoniam vera morte carnis mortuus est pro nobis* ("because he died the true death of the flesh for us"). It is clear that also this part of Augustine's interpretation of Ps. 4 has relevance for the dialogue between him and the Manicheans.

The next verse of the psalm (verse 5) is treated at the beginning of IX.4.10. Its reference to repentance over sin, *irascimini et nolite peccare ... et ... compungimini* ("be angry and do not sin ... and ... be stung [by remorse]") offers Augustine the platform to the next set of Manichean

[35] For more information on the Christology of both Augustine and the Manicheans, see for example Viciano, Aspects christologiques du 'Corpus Paulinum' (above n. 9) or Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme (above n. 1).

terms and other important issue over which he has had to think his way out of Manichean doctrine (in Book VII) before he could finally be converted. The individual himself was responsible for the sins he committed and not some other power over which he had no control:

> *iam didiceram irasci mihi de praeteritis, ut de cetero non peccarem, et merito irasci, quia non alia natura gentis tenebrarum de me peccabat, sicut dicunt qui sibi non irascuntur et thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae et revelationis iusti iudicii tui!*
>
> (I had already learnt to be angry at myself over my sins of the past, so that I would sin no more. And I was angry deservedly, because it was not some other nature from the race of darkness that sinned in me, as those say who are not angry over their sins [deservedly] and they are storing up anger against themselves on the day of anger and of the revelation of your true judgement.)

He urges the Manicheans to repent and confess their sins and even insinuates that because of their refusal to repent, they will be punished on the day of final judgement.[36] Near the end of this section Augustine wishes that the Manicheans might ask him what to do to be saved, *quis ostendet nobis bona?* ("Who will show us where our salvation lies?")[37] and emphasizes, as if in answer, his own repentance and exchange of his old sinful nature for the new.[38]

> *si afferent ad me cor in oculis suis foris a te et dicerent, 'quis ostendet nobis bona?' ibi enim ubi mihi iratus eram, intus in cubili ubi compunctus eram, ubi sacrificaveram mactans vetustatem meam in inchoata meditatione renovationis meae ibi mihi dulcescere coeperas et dederas laetitiam in corde meo.*
>
> (If only they would turn their hearts to me through their eyes that were outside of you, and would say 'Who will show us where our salvation lies?' For there where I was angry with myself, inside in my inner room, where I felt remorse, where I had sacrificed, slaying my old self and where I started the meditation that was to cause my renewal, there You had started to be sweet to me and You had given me joy in my heart.)

---

[36] The final day of reckoning was a concept familiar to the Manicheans. See Ries, La fête de Bêma 226 (above n. 17).

[37] Modern interpreters find this verse of the psalm problematic, but Augustine's interpretation in his *Ennarationes in Psalmos* seems to me to justify my translation here.

[38] This is another concept familiar to the Manicheans, based on their reading of Paul: "Faustus' understanding of anthropology and of conversion is illuminated by Pauline verses which contrast the old man and the new man." Bammel, Pauline exegesis 6 (above n. 9).

What gives this passage added significance is the fact that Augustine is once again talking to the Manicheans in terms and categories familiar to them. A recognition of the need for forgiveness, repentance and regular confession of sins formed an integral part of Manichean ritual, as is shown clearly in the Ries' article, "La fête de Bêma dans l'Église de Mani".[39] We also know that Augustine would have been thoroughly aware of this fact after his nine years as a practicing *auditor* with the Manicheans.[40] How can he then accuse the Manicheans of a lack of confession and repentance? I think that a key might lie in Augustine's interpretation of *irascimini*[41] and in the word *merito* and the phrase following it in the first sentence of IX.4.10. Augustine seems to imply that real repentance depends firstly on a real anger at yourself for your own responsibility in sinning. Secondly it depends on a true conception of what evil is, the question whose Manichean answer had drawn him to them initially but which he has since learnt to answer differently. When he says *merito irasci, quia non alia natura gentis tenebrarum de me peccabat, sicut dicunt qui sibi non irascuntur*, he makes a direct link between confessing and the confessor's concept of evil.

The debate surrounding the *unde malum* question was one of the most essential differences between Augustine and the Manicheans, and one that has been prominent in the preceding narrative of the *Confessions*. The way Augustine interprets Ps. 4, makes repentance and confession and thus by implication the question about evil, one of its central points. In Augustine's eyes the psalm addresses perhaps the two most important issues in Manichean doctrine that he finds unacceptable: their Christology and their beliefs about evil.[42]

The other aspect of chapter 10 that I want to look at briefly is its references to light. For Agustine the word *lumen* in verse 7 of the psalm,

---

[39] Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani 223-226 and 229-230 (above n. 17).

[40] See Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme 278 (above n. 1) and *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 41-45 (above n. 3).

[41] That this word (as well as its form, imperative) is problematic, becomes clear when it is compared to the Hebrew original and when different translations and commentaries on this verse of the psalm are taken into account. It is clear, however, that Augustine interprets it almost literally in the repetitions of the word in the rest of IX.4.10. This also allows him the word play in *qui sibi non irascuntur et thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae.*

[42] See e.g. Robert A. Markus, Augustine's *Confessions* and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism revisited, *Mélanges T. J. van Bavel. Augustiniana* 40-41, vol. 2 (1990) 913-925. He see Augustine's rejection of the Manichean explanation of evil as the most important step in his break with Manicheism.

signatum est in nobis lumen vultus tui, domine ("the light of your face is imprinted in us, o Lord") is heavy with the meanings associated with it in previous parts of the *Confessions* as well as with Manichean connotations.[43] It is still a part of the answer of the question about the nature of evil, of the universe and of God. The terms *lumen/tenebrae* played a prominent role in the dualistic cosmology to the Manicheans who postulated two primary realms, one of light and the other of darkness.[44] They also believed that the souls of both humans and animals consisted of light particles that derived from the substance of God himself.

Augustine's interpretation of these words of Ps. 4 in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* is in general terms,[45] but his explanation in *Conf.* IX.4.10 is yet another feature of this meditation designed explicitly to speak to the Manicheans, *non enim lumen nos sumus quod inluminat omnem hominem, sed inluminamur a te ut, qui fuimus aliquando tenebrae, simus lux in te.* ("For we are not the light which illuminates all men, but we are illuminated by You, so that we who were darkness before, can become light in You").[46]

It is also interesting to note in passing how Augustine combines here the culinary imagery used throughout the *Confessions* with Manichean terminology. It is conceivable that the Manichean doctrine surrounding food and eating was subconsciously (or perhaps even deliberately) influencing Augustine's use of imagery here. The Manicheans believed that the eating habits of their elite helped in the process of liberating light particles from the matter in which it has become imprisoned: they abstained from meat and wine and ate only vegetable foods which were believed to contain light particles.[47] Here Augustine speaks about the Manicheans licking

---

[43] See Chidester, The symmetry of word and light, especially 120 and 126-129 (above n. 1). It is also interesting to note that the book with the most references to *lux* or *lumen* (7 occurrences) is Book 7 where conceptual differences with the Manicheans is hammered out intensively.

[44] For a clear and concise account of the complicated Manichean myth, see Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 16-29 (above n. 3).

[45] In *Enarrationes in Psalmos* he gives an allegorical explanation: *hoc lumen est totum hominis et verum bonum, quod non oculis sed mente conspicitur. 'signatum' autem dixit 'in nobis', tamquam denarius signatur regis imagine.*

[46] Chidester, The symmetry of word and light (above n. 1) is especially illuminating on the differences between the Manicheans and Augustine as far as the exact status and role of light in their religions are concerned. Augustine's words here are also a repetition of the main ideas he has already expressed in *Conf.* VIII. 10.22, where he addresses the Manicheans in a direct protreptic statement: *attendite, quid dicatis, et erubescite et accedite ad eum et illuminamini.*

[47] Gibb and Montgomery, *The Confessions of Augustine* xxvii (above n. 19).

visual images that did not satisfy their hunger, *imagines eorum famelica cogitatione lambiunt*[48] ("they lick the images of temporal things and their thoughts remain hungry"); not eating (certain foods), *o si fatigentur inedia* ("oh, if only they would become tired of fasting"); about having tasted eternity inside himself, *o si viderent internum aeternum, quod ego . . . gustaveram* ("oh, if only they could see the eternity within me, that I . . . had tasted"); and he speaks about not wanting to devour or be devoured by transient temporal things, *devorans tempora et devoratus temporibus*, ("devouring the temporal and being devoured by the temporal") while he had the real food of God's word at his disposal, *cum haberem . . . aliud frumentum et vinum et oleum* ("although I had . . . other corn and wine and oil").

Less obvious, but certainly present throughout this passage there is also the Manichean terminology surrounding the *tochme-sotme* pair, referring to calling and answering.[49] When the central position of *tochme-sotme* within Manichean song and liturgy is taken into account, it seems improbable that Augustine's references to calling and answering in *Conf.* IX.4.8-11 (and perhaps in the rest of the *Confessions*) are accidental. In IX.4.8 Ps. 4:1 is quoted: *cum invocarem, exaudivit me deus iustitiae meae* ("When I called, the God of my righteousness answered me"). In IX.4.9 he tries to convince the Manicheans that the psalm is calling to them personally and assures them of God's welcoming reaction *clamat prophetia . . . clamat quousque, clamat scitote* ("the prophet calls out . . . he calls out 'how long still?' and he calls out 'know'") and *et exaudires eos, cum clamarent ad te* ("and You will answer them when they call out to You").

The last aspect to be looked at is the use of terminology concerning the concept *superbia*. Chidester proposes a convincing argument for seeing Augustine's presentation of his conversion as a conversion from pride to humility. We know that in the *Confessions* the Manicheans are consistently accused of pride. Augustine seems to summarize the effect or purpose of Ps. 4 as "an antidote against pride." In the chapter immediately preceding the meditation there are references to *superbia* and the contrast between (proud) cedars and (humble) herbs, and also the use of the verbs *perdomueris* ("You tamed") and *subegeris* ("You subjected"). The first mention of the psalms of David in IX.4.8 is in terms of their resistance to pride:

---

[48] This is a reference to Plotinus, according to Chadwick, *Augustine. Confessions* 161 (above n. 14).

[49] Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani 224-225 (above n. 17). Van Oort also believes that the emphasis on "God's *clamare* and his *vox* and *vocatio*" in the *Confessions* must be "compared with the pivotal role of the Manichaean Call and Answer," *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 52 (above n. 3).

psalmos David, cantica fidelia, sonos pietatis excludentes turgidum spiritum ("the psalms of David, songs of faith, sounds of piety, that shut out an inflated spirit".) A few lines further Augustine indicates that he would like to recite Ps. 4 to the whole of humanity, *adversus typhum generis humani* ("against the pride of the human race"). It is clear that, even though this is not obvious from a superficial reading, he sees Ps. 4 as a strong warning against pride and thus also in this respect addressing a central Manichean weakness.

Augustine's conclusion to the meditation

All that remains is to take a quick look at the last section of the meditation.[50] IX.4.11 is an exegesis of the two final verses of the psalm: *in pace, in idipsum obdormiam et somnum capiam, quoniam tu, domine, singulariter in spe constituisti me* ("May I go to sleep in peace, in God Himself and fall into a deep sleep, because You, O Lord, have created me for your one eternal hope").[51] It has as its main theme the eschatological peace, which is the ultimate goal of the searching soul, as has been foreshadowed in *Conf.* I.1.1, *et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te* ("and our heart is restless, until it finds rest in You") and with which *Conf.* XIII will end, *post illa nos requieturos in tua grandi sanctificatione speramus . . . quoniam tua quies tu ipse es* ("We hope that after this life we will rest in your great sanctification . . . because the rest that comes from You is You yourself").

The climax of the meditation has been reached. Augustine seems fully focussed on God alone, repeating the personal pronoun as though in an invocation: *et tu es idipsum valde, . . . et in te requires . . . nullus alius tecum . . . quod tu, sed tu, domine, . . .* ("And You are Himself ultimately . . . and in You there is rest . . . there is none other besides You . . . because You, but only You, Lord . . ."). These first 7 lines of IX.4.11 would have been a perfectly fitting end to an ecstatic meditation and communication with God.

But it is important to note that Augustine does not end here. The end of the passage on his reading of Ps. 4 is the sentence, referred to above, where he states his despair at being unable to reach the audience he has been speaking to throughout IX.4.8-11, the *surdis mortuis*. His conclusion is a last attempt to turn around his audience, and constitutes a neat fram-

---

[50] A detailed analysis of this section and especially of its relation to book 13 of the *Confessions* is important, but not part of the arguments of the present article.

[51] Once again, my translation is based on Augustine's interpretation of the verse in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and not on modern interpretations.

ing of the meditation on Ps. 4 by explicit references to its intended audience, the Manicheans.

Conclusion

How does the above analysis influence our understanding of the *Confessions* as a whole? First, Augustine is spending a lot of space on the Manicheans here at the midpoint of the *Confessions* (the need to hasten and tell only the most important events has been stressed just before the start of this passage and is implicitly repeated immediately after it). Secondly, the Manicheans are also important at other key points in the *Confessions*. Van Oort's article shows the prominence of Manichean echoes in *Confessions* I.1.1 and throughout books I-III and Joubert believes that they are the primary group Augustine is trying to reach in book XIII.[52] It is clear that it has become imperative to look more closely at the importance of the Manichean perspective in our reading of the whole of the *Confessions*, as Van Oort has emphasized repeatedly. If IX.4.8-11 mirrors the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole (as O'Donnell points out) and this passage is clearly protreptic in function, then Feldmann's thesis that the *Confessions* belong to the genre of the protreptic deserves more attention than it has received up to now.

Annemaré Kotzé (University of Stellenbosch, South Africa)

LIST OF QUOTED WORKS IN ORDER OF FIRST QUOTATION

1. Johannes van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism in Augustine's *Confessiones*, *Manichaean Studies III, Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"* (1997) 235-247.
2. Johannes van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47 (1993) 276-291.
3. D. Chidester, The symmetry of word and light: perceptual categories in Augustine's Confessions, *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986) 119-133.
4. James J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1992).

---

[52] Van Oort, Manichaeism and anti-Manichaeism (above n. 1) and Catherine Joubert, Le livre XIII et la structure des Confessions de Saint Augustine, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 66 (1992) 77-117. I wish to thank Prof. Johannes van Oort for the conversations at Stellenbosch during 1998 and the material he subsequently put to my disposal.

5. Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996).
6. Julien Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les manichéens, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 9 (1963) 201-215.
7. Johannes van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi 1996).
8. Erich Feldmann, Confessiones, in *Augustinus-Lexicon*, eds. C. Mayer et al. (Basel 1994) 1134-1193.
9. Klaus Berger, Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II*, 25.2 (Berlin 1984) 1031-1432.
10. Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustine* (Paris 1968).
11. C. P. Bammel, Pauline exegesis, Manicheism and philosophy in the early Augustine. In *Christian faith and Greek philosophy in late antiquity. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1993) 1-25.
12. G. Wenning, Der Einfluss des Manichäismus und des Ambrosius auf die Hermeneutik Augustins, *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 36 (1990) 80-89.
13. Alberto Viciano, Aspects christologiques du "Corpus Paulinum" dans la Controverse antimanichéene de Saint Augustin. In *Manichean Studies I* (1991) 379-389.
14. G. N. Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen 1955).
15. *Saint Augustine. Confessions.* Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Henry Chadwick (Oxford 1991).
16. Julien Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 22 (1976) 218-233.
17. John Gibb and William Montgomery eds., *The Confessions of Augustine* (Cambridge 1927).
18. *Saint Augustine. Confessions.* Translated with an introduction by R. S. Pine-Coffin (London 1961).
19. Margaret R. Miles, *Desire and Delight. A new Reading of Augustine's Confessions* (New York 1992).
20. Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967).
21. François E. Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit dans le système manichéen, *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993) 267-273.
22. Robert A. Markus, Augustine's *Confessions* and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism revisited, *Mélanges T. J. van Bavel, Augustiniana* 40-41, vol. 2 (1990) 913-925.
23. Catherine, Joubert, Le livre XIII et la structure des Confessions de Saint Augustin, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 66 (1992) 77-117.

PSALMUS GRATIAE DEI: AUGUSTINE'S "PAULINE" READING OF *PSALM 31*[1]

BY

THOMAS F. MARTIN, O.S.A.

ABSTRACT: A study of Augustine's application of a Pauline lens to his reading of *Psalm* 31, enabling him to conclude that it is a psalm of grace and justification. Such an approach highlights both the unique and original reading of the psalms carried out by Augustine as well as the profound impact the Apostle Paul had upon his biblical and theological endeavors.

On at least two occasions, by now secure in his reputation as eminent biblical scholar, Jerome the *presbyter* made it perfectly clear to the Augustine still novice-bishop that he considered the North African's approach to the psalms unconventional. He tells Augustine, regarding:

> . . . certain commentaries on the Psalms, that if I [Jerome] so wished to discuss them, I would indicate that they were at variance (*discrepare*), not with my interpretation, I who am nobody, but with that of the venerable Greeks.[2]

Jerome is writing in 403 or 404. He proceeds politely (*nihil sum*: he is a presbyter, Augustine a bishop) yet pointedly to insist that he finds in Augustine's work a *discrepatio*—his commentary on the Psalms "disagrees," "clashes" with what Jerome states is the "the venerable Greek tradition." He does not specify the exact nature of the *discrepatio* and in response, Augustine the fledgling bishop only addresses the matter of their specific disagreement "*de illis uerbis Apostoli ad Galatas*," the well-known and much discussed dispute concerning the historicity of *Gal.* 2:11. He says nothing

---

[1] A draft of this study was originally presented as a Master Theme at the *Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Oxford, 16-21 August 1999.

[2] "*. . . et quosdam Commentarios in Psalmos quos si uellem discutere, non dicam a me, quod nihil sum, sed a ueterum Graecorum docerem interpretationibus discrepare.*" Hieronymus, *ep.* 105.5 (Aug.: *ep.* 72.5). Regarding Jerome and the psalms, see Pierre Jay, "Jérôme et la pratique de l'exégèse," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, Bible de tous les temps, 2 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 523-541.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

to Jerome about his off-handed but seemingly disparaging psalm comment. On a second occasion (404), in Jerome's response to Augustine's *Letter* 73, most of the attention once again focuses upon their dispute concerning *Galatians*. Towards his conclusion Jerome does take up the question of the Psalms, noting that much work has already been done by way of commentary both in the Greek East and the Latin West—with the implicit critique that Augustine's psalm work is, at the very least, superfluous. He notes the works of the Greeks: Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodore of Heraclea, Asterius of Scythopolis, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymus of Alexandria, "all who have commented on the whole Psalter."[3] He turns to the Latins noting Hilary of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli who translated Origen and Eusebius, as well as Ambrose who likewise translated Origen and Eusebius. Why, he asks Augustine,

> . . . in the face of so many and so revered interpreters of the Psalms, will you come up with different meanings—*respondeat mihi prudentia tua, quare tu post tantos et tales interpretes in explanatione Psalmorum diuersa senseris?*:[4]

Not only does Jerome gingerly suggest that Augustine's efforts are superfluous but once again he notes that there is something unconventional about Augustine's approach: . . . *diuersa senseris*. What precisely does Jerome intend by this *diuersa senseris*—does it extend beyond their disagreement over the value of the Septuagint in relationship to the Hebrew text? He continues by suggesting that, unlike himself, Augustine is subverting the work of previous commentators.[5] Augustine's next response, his *Letter* 82, is once again

---

[3] ". . . *maxime in explanatione Psalmorum quos apud Graecos interpretati sunt multis uoluminibus, primus Origines, secundus Eusebius Caesariensis, tertius Theodorus Heracleotes, quartus Asterius Scythopolitanus, quintus Apollinaris Laodicenus, sextus Didymus Alexandrinus. Feruntur et diuersorum in paucos psalmos opuscula; sed nunc de integro Psalmorum corpore dicimus. Apud Latinos autem Hilarius Pictauiensis et Eusebius Uercellensis episcopi, Originem et Eusebium transtulerunt: quorum priorem et noster Ambrosius in quibusdam secutus est. Respondeat mihi prudentia tua, quare tu post tantos et tales interpretes in explanatione Psalmorum diuersa senseris?*" *ep.* 73.5. Clearly Jerome notes the "primacy" of Origen in inaugurating the tradition of the psalm commentary. Regarding Jerome and Origen's psalm labors, see Vittorio Peri, *Omelie origeniane sui salmi: Contributo all'identificazione del testo latino*, Studi e testi, 289 (Città del Vaticana: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticano, 1980), but see Jay, 529, n. 25 also idem, "Jérôme à Bethléem: les *Tractatus in psalmos*," in *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. XVIe centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem.* Actes du Colloque de Chantilly (septembre 1986), publiés par Yves-Marie Duval (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1988), 367-380.

[4] Hieronymus, *ep.* 112.20 (Aug., *ep.* 75).

[5] "*Ego enim non tam uetera abolere conatus sum, quae linguae meae hominibus emendata de graeco in latinum transtuli, quam ea testimonia quae a Iudaeis praetermissa sunt uel corrupta, proferre in*

almost entirely devoted to the *Galatians* question, explored at even greater length. Since Augustine makes no mention of Jerome's charge of *diuersa sentire*, a closer look at Augustine's actual interpretation of the *Psalms* may reveal something further concerning the nature of Jerome's charge against Augustine of *discrepatio* and *diuersitas*, especially in the light of the previous exegetical tradition. In particular, this study will explore Augustine's explicit application of a Pauline hermeneutic to an understanding of the Psalms.

A Question Of Originality

Anyone who has had the opportunity to consider Augustine's entire commentary on the *Psalms* notes immediately both the lushness and artistry that marks the whole project. The striking insight, creative application, minute verbal analysis, and consistent pastoral exhortation often reach heights of eloquence and memorable aphorism. Taken as a whole the *Enarrationes* are so thoroughly marked by Augustine's originality of thought and expression that when placed against the larger patristic Psalm-commentary tradition, especially in the Latin west, its uniqueness is immediately apparent. However, Jerome seems to have been struck by something other than Augustine's creative mind and memorable yet distinctive discourse. The *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* suggest that Jerome discovered something disturbingly deeper and more provocatively singular that made Augustine's approach to the psalms problematic for him.[6]

This originality is perhaps one reason for a fresh interest in Augustine's psalm endeavors, part and parcel of an overall renewed interest in the

---

medium, ut scirent nostri quid hebraea ueritas contineret." ibid. Jay highlights Jerome's "Antiochene" approach to exegesis, which begins with "the letter" or "the history," 531. The thrust of Augustine's engagement with the psalms is clearly elsewhere.

[6] While I intend to highlight the Pauline dimension of Augustine's approach to the psalms, suggesting it as something Jerome would have found disconcerting, the "exegetical" controversies between Augustine and Jerome are certainly much wider. To cite one example, Nauroy notes that Jerome's critique of Augustine's approach reflects a more fundamental "anti-Ambrosian" critique, Gérard Nauroy, "Jérôme, lecteur et censeur de l'exégèse d'Ambroise," in *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. XVIe centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem.* Actes du Colloque de Chantilly (septembre 1986), publiés par Yves-Marie Duval (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1988), 197; see Carolinne White, *The Correspondence (394-419) Between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 23 (Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990); also Mark Vessey, "*Conference* and *Confession*: Literary Pragmatics in Augustine's *Apologia contra Hieronymum*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1:2 (1993): 175-213.

Patristic encounter with the scriptures. Surely, the "*Christological—Ecclesiological—Eschatological*" formula of *uox totius Christi* captures well the unique focus that Augustine brought to his overall understanding and approach to the psalms.[7] His application of the hermeneutical, theological, and pastoral lens of the *Christus Totus* enabled him to draw forth from the rich discourse and abundant symbolism of the psalms a reading that made these ancient religious-poetic hymns, both for Augustine and his own congregation, the chants and praises of their very own Christian hearts.[8] These were no longer simply historical texts, precious documents detailing ancient Israel's relationship with God. They were now the songs of present Christian journeying and pilgrimage, present Christian conversion and holiness.[9]

If Jerome was indeed struck by the *diversa sentire* of Augustine's reading of the psalms, perhaps one aspect of this *discrepatio* was its Paulinism. In fledgling form in his initial engagement with the Psalms, with subsequent full blossoming in the course of the Pelagian controvery, Augustine brought to his understanding of the psalms a distinctive Pauline approach. With the Apostle as reading guide, Augustine was able to demonstrate not only

---

[7] This, appropriately, is the title of the recently published and excellent study of Michael Fiedorowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi: Studien zu Augustins "Enarrationes in Psalmos"* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1997). This work is the most up-to-date and comprehensive analysis of Augustine's overall approach to the psalms, with an extensive bibliography on the literature of the *enarrationes*. Regarding the concerns of this study see his considerations of the psalms and grace, 165-175.

[8] Regarding Augustine's notion of *Christus totus* see, Egon Franz, *"Totus Christus" Studien über Christus und die Kirche bei Augustin*, (Bonn: n.p., 1956); Tarsicius J. Van Bavel, O.E.S.A., *Recherches sur la Christologie de saint Augustin: L'humain et le divin dans le Christ d'après saint Augustin*, (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1954); Goulven Madec, *La patrie et la voie: le Christ dans la vie et la pensée de Saint Augustin* (Paris: Desclé, 1989), esp. ch. 6, pt. 5. I would also like to acknowledge the helpful comments of Michael Cameron in his unpublished paper "*Totus Christus* as Hermeneutical Construct in Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*," *The Harp of Prophecy, Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms*, University of Notre Dame, October 18, 1998.

[9] Clearly the question of the psalms fits into larger early Christian concerns stemming from theological debates regarding the status of the Old Testament for the Christian community. Marcion certainly forced this question. Augustine is likewise profoundly shaped by his Manichaean experience, with their wholesale rejection of the Old Testament, including the Psalms (see *Conf.* IX.4.8-11). Since the almost boisterous singing of the psalms marked the popular and widespread devotion of the Donatists, this too will color Augustine's own approach to them, see F. Van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop: Religion and Society at the Dawn of the Middle Ages*, trans. B. Battershaw and G.R. Lamb (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), 325-337.

the unity between Old and New Testaments, but even prophetic confirmation of the primacy of grace.[10] His two commentaries on *Psalm* 31[11] will shed light upon what was perhaps a disconcerting novelty for some or an analytical breakthrough for others, but in either case reveal what is a distinctively Augustinian approach to the psalms.

The first commentary on *Psalm* 31 dates from the 390's and is reflective of Augustine's first serious attempt to engage systematically the psalms, doing so verse by verse and even word by word. The second is, with all likelihood, to be dated to the opening stages of the Pelagian controversy. While post-dating Jerome's comments, it would have confirmed the judgment of the irascible monk and renowned scripture scholar in Bethlehem that Augustine was indeed about something different.

Augustine and Psalm 31

First some comments regarding Augustine's initial exploration of *Psalm* 31 will be helpful—these early efforts provide a point of comparison and contrast with his own later development. It is readily apparent that his beginning labors with the *psalms* (1-32) are striking in their brevity. For the most part these first *enarrationes* consist of a verse from the psalm followed by a brief sentence or phrase from Augustine. Thus the first *enarratio* on Psalm 31 covers 2 pages and some 60 lines in the *CCSL* edition. (To appreciate the contrast, the second runs for some 23 pages, and totals some 826 lines.)

If the second *enarratio* blatantly proclaims *Psalm* 31 to be a psalm of grace, the early Augustine has already begun to move in this direction. In the Patristic tradition of granting no little attention to the "Title,"[12] Augustine's comments sparked by the Psalm's inscription do indeed suggest future developments. The title reads: "*Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae*—[a Psalm] of David, concerning understanding." Augustine thus begins:

> *Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae, qua intelligitur non meritis operum, sed gratia Dei hominem liberari, confitentem peccata sua.*[13]

---

[10] The "Pauline lens" to be explored here is clearly one aspect of a pervasive and complex Paulinism that permeates the entire Augustinian *corpus*.

[11] (*CCSL* XXXVIII, 222-244), *Psalm* 32 according to the Hebrew numeration. I will retain Augustine's Latin numbering of the Psalms for this study.

[12] See Saint Gregory of Nyssa, *Commentary on the Inscriptions of The Psalms*, trans. with an Introduction by Casimir McCambley OCSO (Brookline: MA.: Hellenic College Press, n.d.).

[13] *En. Ps.* 31.I.1.

This early reading of the Psalm certainly reveals a "grace-reading," though not yet blatantly and provocatively proclaimed as will be seen in the second *enarratio.*

Some have described these first efforts as "exegetical notes" because of their brevity (one could picture them being written in the margins of the codex), but a closer look reveals a more complex dynamic—at least by the time he arrives at this psalm. In fact this first *enarratio* on *Psalm* 31 reads like a "mini-*Confessions.*" The language and approach is not "technical-exegetical" but perhaps can best be described as "spiritual paraphrase," with abundant employment of the first person singular. His comments on *vv.* 3 and 4 reveal the dynamic that pervades the entire *enarratio*:

> v.3a. "*Quoniam tacui, inueteraueuerunt ossa mea:*" [he comments] *Quoniam non protuli ore confessionem ad salutem . . .* (*Rm.* 10:10).
>
> v.3b. "*A clamando me tota die:*" [he comments] *cum essem impius atque blasphemus, clamando contra Deum, quasi defendens et excusans peccata mea.*
>
> v.4a. "*Quoniam die ac nocte grauata est super me manus tua:*" [he comments] *Quoniam continua afflictione flagellorum tuorum,*
>
> v.4b. "*conuersus sum in aerumna mea, dum configeretur spina:*" [he comments] *Miser factus sum cognoscendo miseriam meam* (see *Rm.* 7:24), *compunctus mala conscientia.*

These comments seem quite personal. They are not made in the third person [this is what the psalmist says or means], but maintain the first person voice as the words of the Psalmist flow uninterruptedly into Augustine's words: "*in te mihi est gaudium, redime me ab ea tristitia, quam mihi peccata mea faciunt*" (7).[14] Who is speaking here—David or Augustine? Subsequent readers of the *Confessions* will recognize this kind of employment of the psalms to articulate Augustine's own conversion journey. And if this is a Psalm that proclaims grace, it also appears to be a psalm that provokes grace.

---

[14] This has been noted by Clemens Weidman in his communication "Zur exegetischen Technik Augustins in den ältesten *Enarrationes in Psalmos,*" at the *XXVIII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana (6-8 maggio 1999, Augustinianum, Istituto Patristico, Rome), L'Esegesi dei Padri Latini dalle origini a Gregorio Magno.* He notes regarding Augustine's commentaries on *pss.* 15-32 what he calls "allegorische Paraphrase," commenting: "Völlig anders verfährt Augustinus in der zweiten Serie seiner frühesten Psalmenerklärungen. Die achtzehn Enarrationes zu Psalm 15-32 lassen jegliche objective Distanz vermissen. Augustinus schlüpft hier in die Rolle des Psalmisten und paraphrasiert den ganzen Psalm aus dessen Munde allegorisch. Daher möchte ich diese Psalmerklärungen als allegorische Paraphrase bezeichnen. Die Exegese Augustins stellt sich hier nicht mehr als ein Sprechen über einen heiligen Text dar, sondern als ein Mitvollziehen des Gebets, das Augustinus gemeinsam mit dem Psalmsprecher betet."

Augustine notes the loving divine responsiveness to humble human *confessio*. He categorizes v.8a of the psalm as a *responsio*:

> *Responsio Dei*: "*Intellectum dabo tibi, et statuam te in uia hac qua gradieris* (v.8a)." *Intellectum dabo tibi post confessionem, ut non recedas a uia qua ingredieris, ne tuae potestatis esse uelis.* "*Obfirmabo super te oculos meos* (v.8b)." *Ita super te faciam firmam dilectionem meam.*[15]

This early commentary expresses and models a rhetorical- dialogical conversion dynamic where human *confessio* and divine *responsio* are intimately linked. The Psalmist's dialogue with God clearly seems to have become Augustine's own. One does get the impression that herein is the genesis of the *Confessiones*, at least in part. Perhaps not surprisingly *Psalm 31* does appear at least five times in the course of the *Confessiones*, just as in this *enarratio* the forms *confessio/confiteri* occur six times in the course of 11 verses.[16] Is it this intensely personalized approach that Jerome found unsettling, expecting something more rigorous and technical? It certainly operates outside the camp of rigorous lexical and historical methods.

Finally, there is the striking fact that the only Scripture brought forth to clarify the Psalm text in this early commentary comes from Paul's *Letter to the Romans*: 10:10 in v.3 (*ore confessionem ad salutem*) and perhaps an allusion to 7:24 in vs. 4 (*miser factus sum*).[17] Paul is woven into these brief comments seamlessly, perhaps an indication that Augustine has already become aware of the close connection between Paul and the Psalms. However, these condensed comments also serve to highlight the remarkable contrast between first and second *enarratio*, separated by some two decades.

The second commentary, preached very likely in Carthage in the winter of 412-413, is heralded by a bold exordium that is virtually unique among the entire *enarratio* corpus:

> *Psalmus gratiae Dei*—this is a psalm about God's grace, and about our being justified by no merits whatever on our own part, but only by the mercy of the Lord our God which forestalls anything we may do. It is a psalm to which

---

[15] *En. Ps.* 31.II.8.

[16] V.1. "*confitentem peccata sua;*" v.3. "*confessionem ad salutem;*" v.5. "*audiens uocem confessionis in corde;*" v.6. "*remanere confessionis locum;*" v.8. "*intellectum dabo tibi post confessionem;*" v.10. "*qui non confitens Deo peccata sua.*"

[17] Augustine is reading Paul at this very same time. During this period his first attempts at a *Romans'* commentary are undertaken, the *Galatians* commentary is completed, and the *83 Diverse Questions* as well as the *Ad Simplcianum* are published. The classic starting point for the study of this period remains Alberto Pincherle's *La formazione teologica di sant'Agostino* (Rome: L'Airone, n.d.).

> the apostle's teaching has called our attention in a special way, as the reading that preceded the psalm has made clear to us all. And this is the psalm which I, insignificant though I am, have undertaken to expound to you, dearest friends.[18]

Is Augustine reading David or Paul, one might ask? The answer is both—and this connection between Psalmist and Apostle both suggests and reveals some of the particular originality that Augustine brought to his encounter with the Psalms. Perler, following Zarb, places the second *enarratio* on *Ps.* 31 at Carthage during the Winter of 412-413. Though this dating was long ago contested by De Blic who suggests it lacks the "*teneur doctrinale*" that marks the Pelagian controversy,[19] Perler cites Rondet for confirmation

---

[18] "*Psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri, commendatus maxime ore apostolico, sicut praecedens hunc psalmum lectio omnibus intimauit, a nostra tenuitate susceptus est cum Vestra Caritate tractandus,*" *en Ps.* XXXI.II.1. The English text here is taken from *Expositions of the Psalms 1-32*, intro. by Michael Fiedrowicz, trans. and notes by Maria Boulding, O.S.B., The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle (New York: New City Press, 2000), 362. The closest approximation would be the opening lines to his *enarratio* on *Ps.* 70: "*In omnibus Scripturis sanctis, gratia Dei quae liberat nos commendat se nobis, ut commendatos habeat nos,*" en. *Ps.* 70.I.1). Dated to 412-415 (see Fiedrowicz, 434), it still lacks the boldness of his opening lines for *Psalm* 31. For Augustine's commentaries on the psalms, see also Angelo Corticelli, "Introduzione," in Sant'Agostino, *Esposizioni sui Salmi*, I, NBA XXV (Rome: Cittá Nuova Editrice, 1967), vii-xlvii; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, 2 vol. (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982); Georg Nicolaus Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955). Regarding Augustine's "praying" of the psalms, see M. Vincent, "La prière selon saint Augustin d'après les '*Enarrationes in Psalmos*'," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 110 (1988): 371-402; idem, *Saint Augustin Maître de Prière d'après les 'Enarrationes in Psalmos'*, Préface de Marcel Neusch, Édition revue et corrigée, Théologie Historique 84 (Paris: Beauchesne Éditeur, 1990); Card. Michele Pellegrino, *La preghiera dei Salmi in S. Agostino* (Magnano [Italy]: Edizioni Qiqajon, 1984).

[19] J. De Blic, S.I., "La date du sermon de saint Augustin '*in psalmum 31*' (ML 36, 257-275)," *Gregorianum* 17 (1936): 407-412. There are many indications that point to an anti-Pelagian context for the second commentary on the psalm: Augustine's use of the text in the course of the controversy (e.g. *en. Ps.* 118.III.3; *pec. mer.* I.27.43; *nupt. et conc.* I.33; II.34; *c. Iul. imp.* I.67); the relationship between *gratis* and *gratia* (*en. Ps.* 31.II.7), while pre-dating the Pelagian controversy flowers in this period; the most telling is the bold emphasis on "*gratia Dei et iustificatio nostra*," for while Augustine will frequently refer to *gratia* in his polemics against the Donatists, it will specifically have an ecclesial or sacramental reference (e.g. *ep.* 128.44; *Io. eu. Tr.* 3.9; 4.16; *Breu. Col. Don.* 3.20; 42; *ges. Em.* 5). Regarding Augustine's pre-Pelagian preaching on grace, see the informative and perceptive comments of Pierre-Marie Hombert, "Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat," in *Augustin Prédicateur (395-411). Actes du Colloque International*

and Fiedorowicz's most recent study accepts this dating.[20] I would like to propose that it bridges the ending-Donatist/beginning-Pelagian controversy (suggesting how closely interrelated doctrinally are the Donatist and Pelagian debates),[21] that because of this it lacks the intensified polemics that will subsequently scar the later Pelagian debates, and, given the ideological melting-pot that Carthage was, Augustine will recognize other currents of thought circulating in the capital city of Roman Africa. The strongest evidence for its anti-Pelagian origins are still the blatant and provocative opening lines, unmatched in any specifically anti-Donatist literature: *Psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri.* This opening salvo is followed by eight lengthy paragraphs of Pauline explanation before he ever arrives at v.1 of the psalm.[22] The language of these lengthy introductory paragraphs is implicitly apologetic and defensive, sufficient to suggest that Augustine feels obliged to both explain and vindicate his understanding of "*gratia Dei et iustificatio nostra*" in the light of criticism that is circulating.[23]

At the outset he places himself and his congregation on a hermeneutical tightrope stretched over a *uorago*—an abyss. On the one side there is

---

de Chantilly (5-7 september 1996), édités par Goulven Madec, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité—159 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998), 217-245. Hombert clearly presumes that Augustine's second commentary on *Ps.* 31 postdates 412, 233. Hombert's comprehensive study of Augustine and grace provides in-depth theological background for the particular themes explored in his commentary on *Psalm* 31; *Gloria Gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité, 148 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1996).

[20] Othmar Perler (with J.-L. Maier), *Les voyages de saint Augustin* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1969), 310-317, 458-461; Fiedorowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi*, 42-43. Henri Rondet, S.J., "Essais sur la chronologie des «Enarrationes in Psalmos» de saint Augustin," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 61 (1960): 281-286: "On peut donc penser que notre sermon a été prêché à Carthage au début de la querelle pélagienne; de là insistance sur la gratuité de la grâce et l'universalité du péché lors de la venue su Sauveur," 283. Rondet provides lexical and thematic justification for this dating.

[21] At the very least in the sense that both highlight what Hombert calls "des convictions profondes d'Augustine," "Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat," 231.

[22] Nowhere during the Donatist controversy does Augustine speak so forcefully or provocatively about *grace*!

[23] Augustine notes in his *De dono perseuerantiae* (20.53) that decades before while still in Rome, Pelagius was disturbed by *Conf.* X.29.40: *da quod iubes et iube quod uis*. It certainly seems that Caelestius' preaching in Carthage not only critiqued Augustine (at least indirectly) but was also welcomed by certain ascetical circles.

the danger of falling into *praesumptio de iustitia*, and on the other, that of *cogitatio impunitatis peccatorum*—must one either arrogantly rely upon one's own saving power, or submissively capitulate to the inevitability of human weakness? One could further hypothesize a setting for this preaching by suggesting that Pelagius (as explained by his supporters) presents a spiritual program for mature Christian self-starters, and this is made evident and tenable by contrasting it with an alternative vision: a "*Pelagian*" caricature of Augustine's grace position as one proposing a passive and complacent approach to the Christian life, one that seemed to excuse sinning. Augustine, still not willing to attack publicly the ascetic Pelagius, must nonetheless show that there is another way—which represents his authentic theological position:

> *Iterum dico quod breuiter fixum omnes animo teneatis: Ne praesumas ad regnum de iustitia tua, ne praesumas ad peccandum de misericordia Dei. Respondebis: Quid ergo faciam? Psalmus iste docet nos: quo perlecto atque tractato, arbitror adiuuante misericordia Domini, uisuros nos uiam uel ubi iam ambulemus, uel quam tenere debeamus. Unusquisque pro modulo suo audiat; et sicut sibi conscius fuerit, ita uel doleat corrigendus, uel gaudeat adprobandus. Si se deuiasse inuenerit, redeat ut in uia ambulet: si se in uia inuenerit, ambulet ut perueniat. Nemo sit superbus extra uiam, nemo piger in uia.*[24]

Augustine's understanding of grace is opposed to both *pigritia* and *superbia*.

Critical to this interpretation of the psalm as a psalm of grace is the fact that, at the outset, Augustine reminds his congregation that he has chosen a reading from Paul to accompany the psalm:

> *. . . commendatus maxime ore apostolico, sicut praecedens hunc psalmum lectio omnibus intimauit . . .* (ibid.).[25]

Since Paul himself cites Psalm 31 at *Romans* 4:7-8 it can be quite certain that *Romans* 4 is the *lectio praecedens hunc psalmum*. This becomes obvious as he continues his introductory remarks:

> *Hunc autem psalmum ad eam gratiam pertinere, quo christiani sumus, testatus est apostolus Paulus: unde ipsam lectionem uobis legi uoluimus. Hoc dixit Apostolus, cum commenderet iustitiam quae ex fide est, aduersus eos qui gloriantur de iustitia quae est ex operibus, hoc ait* [he cites *Rm*: 4:1-2, a repetition of the *lectio*?]: *"Quid ergo dicemus inuenisse Abraham patrem nostrum secundum carnem? Si enim Abraham ex operibus iustificatus est, habet gloriam, sed non ad Deum." Auertat ipse Deus a nobis talem gloriam, et illud*

---

[24] *En. Ps.* 31.II.1.

[25] This suggests the liturgical-exegetical link in early Christian reading of the Bible, shaped by a Liturgy of the Word where Old Testament, Psalm, and New Testament readings formed a unified *sacramental* whole.

> *potius audiamus: "Qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur"* (1 *Cor.* 1:31). *Multi enim gloriantur de operibus, et inuenis multos paganos propterea nolle fieri christianos, quia quasi sufficiunt sibi de bona uita sua.*[26]

Do we find here a further clue to the conflicting theological poles driving Augustine and the Pelagians—making even more problematic the complexity of Paul's own arguments? Augustine's assertion of the necessity of grace is here closely tied to the deconstruction of Pagan pretensions of self-righteousness—and much recent scholarship suggests the strong hold that "paganism" still continued to have upon Late Antique society.[27] Did Pelagius read Augustine's anti-pagan polemic as irresponsibly supplying Christians with an excuse for complacency? Augustine will give voice to the conflicting Pagan-Christian reception to his teaching. A Pagan's "*iam bene uiuo, quid mihi necessarius est Christus*"[28] could become all too conveniently a Christian's "[*iam credo,*] *quid mihi necessarius est bona opera habere.*"[29]

These are the theological difficulties confronting Augustine as he carefully walks his congregation across the tightrope already indicated. On the one hand, Abraham could claim the glory of righteousness, but it is the righteousness of grace—*gloria ad Deum*: "*Ergo ex fide iustificatus est Abraham*"

---

[26] *En. Ps.* 31.II.2. Augustine makes clear in his commentary on *ps.* 118 that he is well aware of Paul's use of this text. "*Itaque in uiis Domini, quas omnes fides una complectitur, qua in eum creditur qui iustificat impium (Rm. 4:5), qui etiam dixit, "Ego sum uia" (Jn. 14,6), nemo peccatum operatur, sed confitetur. Deuiat ergo, cum peccat; et ideo peccatum uiae non tribuitur, quod a deuiante committitur: sed in uia fidei pro non peccantibus habentur, quibus peccata non inputantur. De quibus apostolus Paulus iustitiam fidei commendans, in psalmo scriptum esse monstrauit. "Beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates, et quorum tecta sunt peccata: beatus uir cui non imputauit Dominus peccatum" (Rm. 4:7, Paul quoting Ps. 31(32): 1-2). Hoc praestant uiae Domini; ac per hoc, quoniam iustus ex fide uiuit (Rm. 1:17), ab ista uia Domini illa alienat iniquitas, quae est infidelitas*" (*en. Ps.* 118.III.3).

[27] This is evident in the newly discovered *Dolbeau sermons 198* (Mainz 62) and *23* (Mainz 59), *Sermons*, III/11, *Newly Discovered Sermons*, translation and notes by Edmund Hill, O.P., The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, (Hyde Park: N.Y.: New City Press, 1997), 180-237, 392-410. The former is dated to 404, the latter, 409; see also Robert Dodaro, "*Christus Sacerdos*: Augustine's Polemic against Roman Pagan Priesthoods in *De ciuitate Dei*," *Augustinianum* XXXIII (1993): 101-135; idem, *Christus sacerdos*: Augustine's Preaching Against Pagan Priests in the light of *S. Dolbeau 26 and 23*," in *Augustin prédicateur (395-411). Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly (5-7 september 1996)*, édités par G. Madec, Coll. "Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité," 159, (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998), 377-393.

[28] *En. Ps.* 31.II.2.

[29] See ibid. 3: "*facio ergo quidquid uolo, quia etsi bona opera non habuero, et tantum credidero in Deum, deputatur mihi ad iustitiam . . .*".

(2). There is no room for *superbia*. On the other hand, the Christian who says: "*faciam ergo quidquid uolo, quia etsi bona opera non habuero, et tantum credidero in Deum, deputatur mihi ad iustitiam*" (3) has already plummeted headlong into the *uorago*: *lapsus demersus est*. There is no room for *pigritia*. Faith-infused grace is not a license to sin. At this point Augustine further highlights the problematic by calling upon the Apostle James (an example of Augustine proceeding *per contraria*):

> *Scriptura autem Dei uerusque intellectus, non solum periclitantem a periculo liberat, sed et demersum a profundo eleuat. Respondeo ergo tamquam contra Apostolum, et dico de ipso Abraham, quod inuenimus etiam in epistola alterius apostoli, qui uolebat corrigere homines, qui male intellexerant istum apostolum* (ibid.).

Just as James challenged those who mis-read Paul, so too must Augustine—a reminder that this psalm *enarratio* continues to be about Paul! He continues:

> *Iacobus enim in Epistola sua, contra eos qui nolebant bene operari de sola fide praesumentes, ipsius Abrahae opera commendauit, cuius Paulus fidem . . .*

If Paul commended *fides Abrahae*, James commended *opera Abrahae*. Thus, the theological position Augustine finds himself struggling to explain is not novel. He continues:

> *Et non sunt sibi aduersi Apostoli. Dicit autem opus omnibus notum, Abraham filium suum immolandum Deo obtulit (Jac.* 2:21). *Magnum opus, sed ex fide. Laudo superaedificationem operis, sed uideo fidei fundamentum: laudo fructum boni operis, sed in fide agnosco radicem. Si autem hoc praeter fidem rectam faceret Abraham, nihil illi prodesset qualecumque illud opus esset. Rursum si sic teneret fidem Abraham, ut cum ei Deus imperaret offerre sibi immolandum filium suum, diceret apud semetipsum, Non facio, et tamen credo quia me etiam contemnentem iussa sua liberat Deus; fides sine operibus mortua esset, et tamquam radix sine fructu sterilis atque arida remaneret* (ibid.).

Both *opus praeter fidem rectam* and *non facio* are equally empty—the one sterile and withered activity, the other dead faith. In the paragraph that follows he gives this a positive restatement:

> *Nemo ergo computet bona opera sua ante fidem: ubi fides non erat, bonum opus non erat. Bonum enim opus intentio facit, intentionem fides dirigit* (4).

However, Augustine is not yet at the point of resolution nor ready to avoid deliberate confrontation to make his point. Decrying "*talis . . . qui optime currit praeter uiam*" he will certainly have vexed the Pelagians with the assertion:

> *Nonne ergo erat melius et tolerabilius, ut esset gubernator ille aliquanto inualidior, ut cum labore et aliqua difficultate gubernacula regeret, et tamen rectum debitumque cursum teneret; rursumque ille pigrius etiam et imbecillius, tamen in uia ambularet, quam praeter uiam*

> *fortiter curreret? Optimus ergo ille qui et uiam tenet, et bene ibi ambulat: sequentis autem spei, qui etsi aliquantum claudicat, non omnino ut erret, aut remaneat, sed progreditur etsi paulatim. Fortasse enim sperandum est, eum quo tendit etiam tardius peruenturum* (ibid.).

Here, it may be suggested, theology, exegesis, and dialectics merge as Augustine perhaps provocatively responds to latent Pelagian reductionism with his own form of the same: either *praeter uiam* or *in uia*. There can only be one choice! Although limping, those *in uia* will arrive; those *praeter uiam*, even if sprinting, are already lost.

Augustine, though, has still not completed his lengthy explanatory introduction that will serve as reading guide once the text of the Psalm is finally taken up. Paul himself will suggest the formula of resolution for the seemingly "active—passive" dilemma, with his intimate linking of *fides* and *dilectio*. What kind of faith does Augustine propose? *Fides quae per dilectionem operatur* (*Gal.* 5:6). Augustine restates this into an aphorism that blends theological complexity with linguistic precision: *tene ergo fidem operaturus*—"as you're about to act, hold on to faith" (5). In order to make this point there follows an intense employment of Pauline texts, interspersed with brief formulaic comments by Augustine. In the next four paragraphs he cites *Rm.* 13:10; *Gal.* 5:14; back to *Rm.* 13:9,10; then 1 *Cor.* 13:13; 1 *Tm.* 1:5; *Rm.* 3:28; again *Gal.* 5:6; 1 *Cor.* 13:2; back to *Rm.* 4:5; 1:25; 3:23; 4:3,4; 6:23; 4:5,6. These fourteen references to Paul have only been briefly interrupted by *Ps.* 36:27 (*declina a malo et fac bonum*), a brief reference to *Luke*'s (10:30) parable of the Good Samaritan, read now in a grace context (*memento quia etsi languebas, et in uia semiuiuus iacebas, leuatus es in iumentum, et perductus in stabulum*), and *Ps.* 35:4 (*noluit intelligere ut bene ageret*). The crisp aphoristic assertions sprinkled throughout provide clarity:

> *Ipsa dilectio uacare non potest* (5).
> *Purga ergo amorem tuum* (5).
> *Quod credit, fidei est, quod operatur, caritatis est* (twice repeated), (5).
> *Opus autem fidei dilectio est* (6).
> *Noli remanere, noli retro conuerti, noli deuiare* (6).
> *Si uis esse alienus a gratia, iacta merita tua* (7).
> *Nemo iactet bona opera sua ante fidem, nemo sit piger in bonis operibus accepta fide* (8).

There is, it could be said, a deliberate *cumulative* effect intended by this approach. Augustine's listeners are overwhelmed by a flood of scriptural citations affirming the interconnection between grace, faith, and love; they are summoned to action by call after call to make love operative; and they are reassured by the sheer weight, drive, and confidence of Augustine's method and discourse that this way is secure—the *pigritia/superbia* dilemma is thus resolved. Augustine thereby can exonerate himself from any accusations

of misleading the flock entrusted to him. One cannot miss the polemic implied here as he completes his summary statement before beginning at long last to take up the actual psalm text. He insists *ego liber sum*—as Paul was *liber*. I have done my duty and am free from any charge of pastoral irresponsibility (there is clear identification here between Augustine and Paul):

> *Intendite ergo uos: alioquin male intelligendo proicitis uos in illam uoraginem impune peccandi: et ego liber sum, sicut ipse Apostolus ab omnibus male intelligentibus liber fuit. Libenter enim male intellexerunt, ne bona opera sequerentur. Nolite esse de numero talium, fratres. Dicitur in quodam psalmo, de quodam homine tali, id est de tali genere, quasi de uno: "Noluit," inquit, "intelligere ut bene ageret" (Ps.* 35:4). *Non dictum est, Non potuit intelligere. Uos ergo oportet ut uelitis intelligere,* (note the active understanding) *ut bene agatis. Intellectus enim uobis non deerit manifestus. Quis est manifestus intellectus? Nemo iactet bona opera sua ante fidem, nemo sit piger in bonis operibus accepta fide. Dat Deus ergo indulgentiam omnibus impiis, et eos iustificat ex fide* (8).

At this point, Augustine has completed 1/3 of the homily and has not yet arrived at the text of the psalm that is driving the homily. It might be said that these lengthy introductory comments have served two purposes for Augustine, expressed in his attention just now to *manifestus intellectus*. If this is indeed a psalm of grace and justification, it is also, at its title indicated, a psalm of *intelligentia*: "*ipsi Dauid intelligentiae.*" *Intelligentia gratiae* is what the psalmist prophesized, what Paul proclaimed, and what Augustine and his fellow Christians now live. *Manifestus intellectus* will be apparent in the unity of *fides* and *opera*, markedly contrasting with the antithesis of *superbia* and *praesumptio* (*pigritia*) that have been denounced with equal vigor. This enables him at last to undertake the psalm text:

> *Iam Psalmus incipit, et incipit intellectus. Intellectus ergo uel intelligentia ipsa est, ut noueris nec iactare te debere de meritis tuis, nec praesumere de impunitate peccati* (9).

His engagement at last with the psalm echoes his beginning words of the homily: *psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri.* And despite his assertions that he has already discharged his duty—*ego liber sum*—it is apparent that he will leave nothing to chance regarding the depth of this understanding:

> *Prima ergo intelligentia, ut te noueris peccatorem. Consequens intelligentia est, ut cum ex fide per dilectionem bene coeperis operari, ne hoc uiribus tuis, sed gratiae Dei deputaueris* (ibid.).

The actual verse by verse commentary that finally commences becomes an on-going lesson in both humility and responsibility—a clear indication of the nuanced nature of the *intelligentia* Augustine is holding up for emula-

tion. Without ever being able to accuse Augustine of proceeding by the straight and narrow path, his circuitous method is in many ways held together by the Lukan Pharisee and Publican (see *Lk.* 18: 9ff., perhaps the gospel of the day). [Many of the other scriptural texts called upon will be stimulated by terminological connections with the psalm text (e.g. *dolus* will lead him to *Mt.* 23:27 and *John* 1:47—Pharisees with *dolus*, Nathaniel without *dolus*).] They become types: the one representing *superbia: in defensione peccatorum suorum iactantes merita sua* (10), the other, exemplifying *humilitas: tunsio pectoris, obtritio cordis* (11). These two fundamental approaches will carry through the rest of the psalm commentary. The Pharisee:

> "*uerba habebant, facta non habebant*" (9), "*genus superbiae*" (10), "*quia spernebat ceteros*" (11), "*peruersus et nesciens*" (12), "*tacuit confessionem, clamauit praesumtionem*" (13), "*exaltatur*" (14), "*clamando in defensione peccati sui*" (15), "*pronuntiare aduersus Deum*" (16), etc.

The Publican:

> "*ille enim fortis est, qui non in se, sed in Deo fortis est*" (10), "*sed percutiebat pectus suum*" (11), "*se adtendebat, ut primo sibi displiceret, et sic Deo placeret*" (12), "*nihil praeter se respiciet, et displicebit sibi, quia agnoscit se*" (13), "*quia humiliauit se*" (14), "*sensus doloris*" (15), "*clamat aeger ad medicum*" (16), etc.

The indictment of the pride of the Pharisee is in direct proportion to the affirmation of the humility of the Publican. And throughout Paul repeatedly returns as model and example for this theology of grace:

> *Ille enim fortis est, qui non in se, sed in Deo fortis est. Propter illud, "Ter Dominum rogaui ut auferret eum a me; et dixit mihi: Sufficit tibi gratia mea." "Gratia mea," dixit, "non uirtus tua." "Sufficit," inquit, "tibi gratia mea; nam uirtus in infirmitate perficitur"* (2 *Cor.* 12: 8-9). *Unde alio loco ipse ait: "Quando infirmor, tunc fortis sum"* (2 *Cor.* 12:10) (10).

The *stimulus carnis* of Paul models and confirms the humble stance of grace-dependent Christian living—a condition that continues even after justification. Thus Paul himself witnesses to the correct understanding of his own theology of grace. Augustine takes up v.7 of the psalm: "*exsultatio mea, redime me,*" and Paul provides the explanation:

> *Iam iustificatus erat et Apostolus, et quid ait? "Non solum," inquit, "sed etiam nos ipsi primitias habentes Spiritus, et ipsi in nobismetipsis ingemiscimus"* (*Rm.* 8:23). *Unde "redime me?" Quia "ipsi in nobismetipsis ingemiscimus, adoptionem expectantes, redemtionem corporis nostri." Ecce ergo unde "redime me;" quia adhuc expectamus in nobis ingemiscentes redemtionem corporis nostri. Unde ergo "exsultatio mea?" Ibi sequitur idem Apostolus, et dicit, "Spe enim salui facti sumus: spes autem quae uidetur, non est spes. Quod enim uidet quis, quid sperat? Si autem quod non uidemus speramus, per patientiam expectamus"* (*Rm.* 8:24-25) (20).

He goes on to note how this humble *spes* leads to *patientia* and *tolerantia* regarding the present *angustia*. What we see underway here is likewise Augustine's developing awareness of what is and is not to be expected *sub gratia*: "*iam iustificatus erat et apostolus.*"[30] This too is what is meant by *intelligentia gratiae*:

> *Respondetur: "Intellectum dabo tibi" (Ps.* 31:8a). *Ipse est psalmus intelligentiae. "Intellectum dabo tibi, et statuam te in uia hac, qua gradieris." Quid est, "statuam te in uia hac, qua gradieris?" Non ut haereas ibi, sed ut ab ea non aberres. Dabo intellectum, ut cognoscas te semper, et semper gaudeas in spe ad Deum; donec ad illam patriam peruenias, ubi iam non spes, sed res erit. "Obfirmabo super te oculos meos"* (8b). *Non a te auferam oculos meos, quia et tu non auferes a me oculos tuos. Iam iustificatus, iam post remissionem peccatorum leua oculos tuos ad Deum. Putruerat enim cor tuum cum esset in terra. Non gratis audis, Sursum cor, ne putreat"* (21).

Both directly and indirectly he consistently asserts that *superbia* remains the continuing enemy of grace, and *superbia* can be reduced to false self-knowledge: *dabo intellectum ut cognoscas te semper.* Thus, even after Baptism, there is room only for humility, and this is what Paul teaches to the *iam iustificatus*: "*tu ergo oculos tuos in illum erige, et non timebis*" (ibid). This is the *intellectus*, manifested in both joy and uprightness of heart—and this will take Augustine to the conclusion where *exsultatio* and *cor rectum* offer critical components for the *intelligentia gratiae* Augustine has been about throughout the psalm, one precluding *pigritia*, the other, *superbia*.

Exsultate, the psalmist says. How ought one understand this *exsultatio*?

> *Ergo quid concluditur? "Laetamini in Domino, et exsultate iusti* (v.11)." *O qui laetamini in uobis! o impii, o superbi, qui laetamini in uobis: iam credentes in eum qui iustificat impium, deputetur fides uestra ad iustitiam (Rm.* 4:4). "*Laetamini in Domino, et exsultate iusti.*" "*Et exsultate,*" *subaudi,* "*in Domino.*" *Quare? Quia iam iusti. Unde iusti? Non meritis uestris, sed gratia illius. Unde iusti? Quia iustificati* (24).

This call to true joy precludes any passive or complacent understanding of what is meant by the reception of grace and justification. On the other hand, and Augustine is now at his final words of the homily, a *cor rectum* insures that one knows what to attribute to oneself, and what to attribute to God:

> *Breuiter dico, sed tamen maxime commendandum: Deo autem gratias, quod in fine est, inhaereat sensibus uestris. Inter rectum cor et prauum cor hoc interest: quisquis homo quidquid patitur praeter uoluntatem, afflictiones, moerores, labores, humilitationes, non tribuit nisi uoluntati Dei iustae, non illi dans insipientiam . . .* (25).

---

[30] A few paragraphs earlier he quoted from *Rm.* 7 and still seems to view it as a "*sub lege*" statement. Here, however, he is clearly states that even after grace—"*iam iustificatus erat*"—there is turmoil and struggle.

If Job is the classic example of this, humbly bearing with his own abasement:

> *"Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit." Ecce rectum cor: Sicut Domino placuit, ita factum est; "sit nomen Domini benedictum"* (cfr. *Iob* 1:21) (26).

this is to be found above all in the *exemplum* of the Only Son:

> *Etiam Unicus sine peccato, non tamen sine flagello. Unde ipse Unicus portans infirmitatem tuam, et praefigurans in se personam tuam, tamquam caput gestans personam etiam corporis sui, cum adpropinquaret passioni ex homine quem gerebat contristatus est, ut te laetificaret; contristatus est, ut te consolaretur* (ibid.).

Here Augustine calls to mind that it has been the *uox totius Christi* that has been speaking throughout this psalm. And Paul, now "*miles*," has learned his lessons well from his "*imperator*."

> *Adtende Paulum exsultantem, propinquantem passioni: "Ego autem iam," inquit, "immolor, et tempus resolutionis meae instat. Bonum certamen certaui, cursum consummaui, fidem seruaui: de cetero superest mihi corona iustitiae, quam mihi Dominus reddet in illa die iustus iudex. Non solum autem mihi, sed et omnibus qui diligunt aduentum eius"* (2 *Tm.* 4:6-8). *Uidete quemadmodum exsultat, uenturus ad passionem. Ergo gaudet coronandus, contristatur coronaturus. Quid igitur portabat? Infirmitatem quorumdam, qui ueniente tribulatione uel morte contristantur. Sed uide quomodo eos ducit in directionem cordis . . .* (ibid.).

Thus Paul and even the Pauline lens through which Augustine reads the Psalm finally gives way to a Christ-reading of the Psalm: *uidete quomodo hoc docet Dominus Iesus Christus . . .* (ibid.). This, in the final analysis, is the *directio cordis* Augustine learned from Paul, and the *directio cordis* that was the ultimate intention of the Psalmist:

> *Hoc ergo fac, gaudens in his quae tibi accidunt: et si uenerit dies ille ultimus, gaude. Aut si subrepit humanae cuiusdam uoluntatis fragilitas, cito dirigatur in Deum, ut sis in eis quibus dicitur: Gloriamini omnes recti corde* (ibid.).

Augustine ends not only with the image of *cor rectum* but also of *uoluntatis fragilitas*—grace leaves no room for arrogant complacency.

Conclusion

Certainly Jerome was correct in noting that Augustine was about something different in his approach to the psalms. Here, in *Psalm* 31, Augustine found a prophecy of grace, the expression of the unity between the two Testaments (David/Paul), an instance of the voice of *Christus caput* prefiguring the voice of *Christus corpus*, and all of this carefully viewed through the reading lens of privileged Pauline texts. Augustine has certainly highlighted

the prophetic nature of the psalms, a marked contrast with at least some of the Greek tradition that remained within the historical dimension of the psalms. This is quite apparent in Julian of Eclanum's Latin version of Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the *Psalms*—interestingly the only other intact Latin commentary on *Psalm* 31 from the period.[31] In Julian's translation, Theodore locates the message of the *Psalm* within the context of Hezekiah's illness as a prophecy of recovery.[32] For Augustine, however, the *Psalm*'s primary intent and message is ever Christ. It is is *a prophecy of grace*,[33] and for this reading Augustine turns to Paul:

> *"Pro hac orabit ad te omnis sanctus, in tempore opportuno:" quando manifestabitur Nouum Testamentum, quando manifestabitur gratia Christi, quod est tempus opportunum . . .*[34]

Perhaps Augustine himself would object to any effort to propose a unitary Pauline lens for reading the psalms: *doctrina Dei una est* he would surely insist (ibid.). Yet, the fact is that Paul is more present than David in this psalm commentary, 31 explicit citations from Paul compared to the psalm's eleven verses: Paul literally overtakes this psalm. What is one to make of this? What seems clear is that Augustine's awareness of how Paul himself took up this psalm in his *Letter to the Romans* and re-read the Abrahamic-Mosaic tradition in the light of Christ provided Augustine with the necessary impetus to continue exploring, developing, and certainly expanding these initial Pauline connections.[35] If indeed the psalms are the *uox Christi, caput et corpus*, it was Paul's very own voice that helped Augustine realize this, echoed by his persistent calling upon the Apostle throughout to secure a correct reading: "*sicut dicit Apostolus*" (1), "*testatus est apostolus Paulus*" (2), "*hoc ergo Apostolus sic commendauit*" (7), "*Attende Paulum*" (26), etc. Paul guided and enlightened Augustine's reading of *Psalm* 31, and, it may be suggested,

---

[31] The *Breuiarium in Psalmos* (*PL* XXVI, 911-914 for *Psalm* 31), long attributed to Jerome, has been shown to be spurius, CCL LXXII, v; see Peri, 29. There is merely a brief 10 lines comment on *Psalm* 31 in Jerome's *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, XXX1 (*CCSL* 72, 203-204).

[32] <Psalmus> XXX<I>, 1-2, (*CCSL* LXXXVIII/A, 139). See Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier*, I, 175-188.

[33] Regarding the psalms as prophecy see Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi*, 110, 142, 138, 234.

[34] *En. Ps.* 31.II.18.

[35] At the outset of these considerations, the presence of Paul and grace in the first *enarratio* was noted: "*Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae, qua intelligitur non meritis operum, sed gratia Dei hominem liberari, confitentem peccata sua,*" *en. Ps.* 31.I.1. See also note 26.

this Pauline lens reveals one aspect of the Bishop of Hippo's unique and distinctive approach to the Psalms. What Jerome noted early on as *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* would only continue to blossom and flourish in Augustine, but with a contrary intention, to show the lack of *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* between David and Paul, Old Testament and New, prophecy and fulfillment. Paul taught all this to Augustine, that this was a *Psalm of grace and justification*, the grace and justification of Christ, a reminder once again of the profound and pervasive impact the Apostle Paul had upon the Bishop of Hippo.

Villanova University, Dept. of Theology/Religious Studies
Villanova, PA 19085, U.S.A.

FULGENTIUS VON RUSPE, *EPIST.* 13,3: *THAPSENSIS* ODER *THARRENSIS*?

VON

ANTONIO PIRAS

1. Bekannt sind die Ereignisse, die sich in Nordafrika in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 5. Jahrhunderts abspielten, als die Vandalen von Geiserich, nachdem sie das schon schwankende Herz des weströmischen Reiches überflutet hatten, eine der reichsten und romanisiertesten Provinzen durch die Straße von Gibraltar erreichten. Sie landeten in Afrika 429 und nur zehn Jahre darauf eroberten sie Karthago, so daß Valentinian III. nicht umhin konnte, ihre Herrschaft anzuerkennen.

Von da an beherrschten die Vandalen das Westmittelmeer und plünderten seine Küsten: Sizilien, Sardinien, Korsika, die Balearen und die übrigen nordafrikanischen Provinzen fielen recht bald in Geiserichs Hände. Im Friedensvertrag, der 474 zwischen dem Vandalenkönig und dem Kaiser Zenon abgeschlossen wurde, wurden alle Eroberungen des Geiserich anerkannt.[1]

Betreffs der Religionspolitik erwiesen sich die Vandalen als nicht tolerant: Sie zielten nämlich darauf hin, dem im Gebiete schon gewurzelten Katholizismus einen starren Arianismus aufzudrängen, der nicht nur ein bequemes *instrumentum regni* darstellte, sondern auch eine Art, ihre ethnische Identität zu schützen.[2] Nach Geiserichs Tod wurde solche katholikenfeindliche Politik von seinen Nachfolgern, insbesondere von Thrasamund fortgeführt, der verordnete, man sollte keine neuen katholischen Bischöfe mehr ernennen, um das Aussterben des katholischen Episkopats dadurch hervorzurufen. Dennoch, als sich die Zahl der offenen Stühle vermehrte, handelten die Bischöfe der Byzacena dem Edikt Thrasamunds zuwider und sorgten dabei für die Nachfolge. Bei dieser Gelegenheit wurde auch Fulgentius trotz seiner Protesten zum Bischof von Ruspe ernannt.

---

[1] Zu diesen Ereignissen vgl. im allgemeinen Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955).

[2] Vgl. dazu H.E. Giesecke, *Die Ostgermanen und der Arianismus* (München 1939).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 156-160

Thrasamunds Reaktion ließ auf sich nicht warten und die rebellischen Bischöfe wurden verbannt. Auf Sardinien kamen somit etwa hundert Geistlichen an: da waren z.B. Felicianus von Karthago und der Bischof von Hippo, der die sterblichen Reste des Augustinus mitbrachte.[3] All diese Geistlichen wurden vom Bischof von Calaris Primasius (oder Brumasius) gastfreundlich aufgenommen.

Nach der *Vita Fulgentii* zeichnete sich der neugewählte Bischof von Ruspe vor all diesen Persönlichkeiten aus, deren er die *lingua* und das *ingenium* war.[4] Während seines insgesamt fast fünfzehnjährigen Aufenthaltes auf Sardinien gründete Fulgentius eine Mönchsgemeinschaft mit einem eigenen Skriptorium, welche wider Thrasamunds Absicht einen echten Resonanzboden seiner Lehre darstellte.[5] Hier verfasste er verschiedene theologische Schriften, um die ihm gestellten Fragen (typisch ist der Fall der Briefe 15. und 17.) zu beantworten, wie die *Vita* berichtet.[6]

2. Zur verbliebenen Korrespondenz des Fulgentius gehört auch der Briefwechsel mit seinem Schüler Ferrandus, der nach Lapeyre aus den Jahren 523-527 datiert.[7] Der zweite Brief des Ferrandus an Fulgentius, der in der Ausgabe von J. Fraipont[8] als *epistula* XIII erscheint, ist in der Handschriftentradition als *Epistula de quinque quaestionibus* bezeichnet[9] wegen des in fünf Punkte gegliederten Inhalts. Solche Punkte entsprechen den Fragen, die Ferrandus dem Meister unterbreitet:[10] 1. *Utrum Trinitas inseparabilis propter unam eamdemque naturam, operationem ac uoluntatem, dici debeat separabiles habere personas, an etiam in personis sit omnino separabilis praedicanda* (13,2,1ff.); 2. *Utrum Deus Dei Filius sicut dicitur natus, passus, mortuus, crucifixus; ita eius diuinitatem confirmare nos oporteat natam, passam, mortuam, crucifixam* (13,2,14ff.); 3. *Utrum anima Christi susceptricis deitatis plenam habeat omnino notitiam* (13,2,20f.); 4. Daraus, daß die afrikanische Kirche pflegt, *per Iesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum, qui tecum uiuit et regnat in unitate Spiritus*

---

[3] Vgl. P. Siniscalco, Agostino, l'Africa e la Sardegna, *L'Africa romana. Atti del VI convegno di studio* (Sassari 1989) 535-545; als etwas problematisch erweist sich L.M. Gastoni, Le reliquie di S. Agostino in Sardegna, *ebd.* 583-593.

[4] *Vita Fulg.* 18 (PL 65,138).

[5] Vgl. E. Cau, Fulgenzio e la cultura scritta in Sardegna agli inizi del VI secolo, *Sandalion* 2 (1979) 221-229, bes. 223.

[6] *Vita Fulg.* 18.

[7] G.G. Lapeyre, *Vie de Saint Fulgence de Ruspe* (Paris 1929) 330.

[8] J. Fraipont, *Sancti Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis opera* (Turnhout 1968) 384-387 (CCL 91).

[9] Solch ein Titel kommt schon im Codex Parisinus lat. 2156 (Bibl. Nat.) aus dem 10. Jh. vor.

[10] Vgl. A. Isola (ed.), *Fulgenzio di Ruspe. Le lettere* (Roma 1999) 225-226.

sancti zu beten, kann man schließen, daß nur der Sohn mit dem Vater herrscht? (13,2,34ff.); 5. In der lukanischen Erzählung des Abendmahls wird von zwei verschiedenen Kelchen oder von einem zweimal angebotenen Kelch gesprochen? (13,2,42ff.).

3. Der Teil, der uns interessiert, ist der Briefschluß. Ferrandus bittet hier Fulgentius um eine Kopie des Buches *De regula uerae fidei*[11] und eines jetzt verlorenen Briefes an einen gewissen *Iohannes Tharsensis episcopus*, wo man über einen (vielleicht den *maleficia* ergebenen) Verbrecher diskutierte, der dem Richter nicht ausgeliefert werden sollte:

> *Rogo etiam, ut librum de regula uerae fidei relegendum nobis iubeas destinari, et epistulam ad Iohannem Tharsensem episcopum, ubi de malefico quodam iudici non tradendo memini plenissime disputatum* (13,3,55-58).

Was *Iohannes Tharsensis episcopus* betrifft, meint A. Mandouze,[12] der sich eine Konjektur von Fraipont[13] zu eigen macht, in der Handschriftenüberlieferung liege hier eine Korruptel statt eines ursprünglichen *Thapsensis* vor, da es sich um eine «siège dont l'appartenance à l'Afrique n'est pas certaine» handele. In der Tat war *Thapsus* der Name eines Städtchens der Byzacena (heute Ras Dimas, in Tunesien) und obendrein der Bischofssitz des berühmten Vigilius, der am sogenannten Konzil von Karthago 484 teilnahm.[14]

Eine sorgfältige Prüfung der Handschriften dürfte aber einer anderen und meines Erachtens triftigeren Interpretation aufmachen. Drei der fünf Handschriften, die den Brief des Ferrandus überliefern, d.h. U (10. Jh.), F (11. Jh.) und Y (13. Jh.),[15] bieten *tarsensem* an, wogegen die ältesten, d.h. A (8. Jh.) und K (9. Jh.),[16] *tarrensem* haben.

---

[11] Es handelt sich um die Schrift *De fide ad Petrum*: Fraipont CCL 91 A, 709-760.

[12] A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*: Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire 1 (Paris 1982) 608.

[13] Fraipont, S. VII.

[14] Über Vigilius von Thapsus vgl. im allgemeinen M. Simonetti, Vigilio di Tapso, *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane* (Genova 1984) 3591f.; Mandouze, 1204f. Im Bischofslist des Konzils von Karthago erscheint Vigilius nicht als *Thapsensis*, sondern als *Thapsitanus*: vgl. J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 7 (Nachdr. Graz 1960-62), 1161. Das adjektiv von Thapsus ist also nicht *Thapsensis*, sondern *Thapsitanus*, was unsere These zu bestätigen scheint.

[15] U = Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2156; F = Vaticanus Latinus 641; Y = Codex Alcobacensis CCVII (415), Lisboa, Bibl. Nac.

[16] A = Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 1796; K = Troyes, Bibl. Munic. 2405.

Von einem streng philologischen Gesichtspunkt aus versteht man nicht die Notwendigkeit, in den Text mit solch einer konjekturalen Berichtigung einzugreifen, zumal die durch beide ältesten Handschriften überlieferte Lesart alle Voraussetzungen erfüllt, um aufgenommen zu werden.[17] Die Variante *tarrensis* bezieht sich offensichtlich auf Tharros, eine wohlbekannte und aus der phönizisch-punischen Zeit stammende Küstenstadt Westsardiniens,[18] die höchstwahrscheinlich schon im 6. Jahrhundert einen Bischofsstuhl hatte. Das scheint durch einen am Ende der fünfziger Jahre ausgegrabenen altchristlichen Kultkomplex bestätigt zu sein. Dieser Komplex besteht aus einer *ecclesia cathedralis* und einem Monumentalbaptisterium mit rechteckigem Plan, das aus 5. bzw. 6. Jh. datieren dürfte.[19] In einer neuerschienenen und wertvollen Arbeit denkt P.G. Spanu genauererweise, «che la diocesi con gli ambienti funzionali alla sede vescovile risalga all'estrema età vandalica, durante la permanenza dei presuli africani esiliati da Trasamondo in Sardegna nei primi decenni del VI secolo».[20]

In Anbetracht der Datierung des 13. Briefes aus den Jahren 523-527 (die verlorene *epistula ad Iohannem* datiert selbstverständlich aus einiger Zeit früher und läßt sich wahrscheinlich auf den sardinischen Aufenthalt des Fulgentius zurückführen) darf man annehmen, dieser Iohannes, dessen Bischofsstuhl nicht viel früher gestift worden sollte, hat die maßgebende Anwesenheit des Fulgentius genutzt, um ihm eine spezifische und konkrete Frage zu unterbreiten, d.h. ob ein bestimmter Verbrecher dem Richter auszuliefern war. Wir haben übrigens gesehen, daß selbst die *Vita Fulgentii* berichtet,[21] während des sardinischen Exils und freilich auch nach seiner Heimkehr erteilte der Bischof von Ruspe Ratschläge all denjenigen, die ihm theologische Fragen und pastorale Probleme vorlegten.

Es fehlen also auch keine geschichtlichen Beweise, um die durch die zwei ältesten Handschriften belegte Lesart zu verteidigen. Es ist außerdem

---

[17] Unabhängig von dieser Arbeit ist Raimondo Zucca der Universität Sassari in einem Aufsatz, der im Druck ist, zum selben Schluß gekommen. Bei ihm bedanke ich mich sehr dafür, daß er mir sein Manuskript so freundlich gezeigt hat.

[18] Zu dieser Stadt vgl. insbesondere P. Meloni, *La Sardegna romana* (Sassari ²1990) 286-291.

[19] Vgl. dazu A. Boscolo, Su due fonti battesimali protocristiani della Sardegna, *Archivio Storico Sardo* 27 (1961) 101-114, welcher für Tharros an einen *chorepiscopus* denkt; vgl. auch P. Testini, Il battistero di Tharros, *Atti del XIII Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura. Cagliari, 6-12 aprile 1963* (Roma 1966) 191-199.

[20] P.G. Spanu, *La Sardegna bizantina tra VI e VII secolo* (Oristano 1998) 83.

[21] *Vita Fulg.* 18 (PL 65,139) *domus illa tunc Caralitanae ciuitatis oraculum fuit.*

bedeutungsvoll—ohne den Grundsatz *recentiores non deteriores* zu ignorieren—, die Handschriften, die *tarsensem* haben, sind zeitgenössisch oder sogar später als der Untergang der Stadt und als die Bischofsstuhlverlegung von Tharros nach Oristano, die um 1070 vorfiel.[22] Die Vergessenheit von Tharros und vielleicht auch die biblische *ruminatio* der Schreibermönche, denen Ortsnamen wie *Tharsis* und *Tarsus* vertraut waren, dürften die Korruptel von *T(h)arrensem* in *T(h)arsensem*[23] herbeigeführt haben.

Facoltà Teologica della Sardegna
I-09129 *Cagliari*, via Sanjust 13

[22] Vgl. R. Turtas, *Storia della Chiesa in Sardegna dalle origini al Duemila* (Roma 1999) 109, Anm. 36.

[23] Das Adjektiv *Tharsensis* erscheint z.B. in Apg 9,11.

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR ON THE STRUCTURAL DYNAMICS OF REVELATION

BY

ADAM G. COOPER

In the longest of Maximus' *Ambigua* addressed to his spiritual associate Bishop John of Cyzicus, we come across what has become in Maximian research a virtual *locus classicus* on the reciprocal relationship between divine incarnation and human deification:

> For [the Fathers] say that God and man are paradigms one of another: God is humanised to man through love for humankind to the extent that man, enabled through love, deifies himself to God; and man is caught up noetically by God to what is unknown to the extent that he manifests God, who is invisible by nature, through the virtues.[1]

Modern scholars have commented extensively on this distinctive *tantum-quantum* (τοσοῦτον—ὅσον) formula,[2] noting its linguistic roots in Gregory Nazianzen[3] and conceptual roots in Athanasius[4] and Irenaeus.[5] In Maximus' spiritual theology it expresses with especial clarity the directness of the reciprocity between divine incarnation and human deification—most particularly, it should be noted, in the specific context not of the historic

---

[1] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1113BC). Reading τὸ ἄγνωστον with Polycarp Sherwood ('The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and His Refutation of Origenism', *Studia Anselmiana* 36 (Rome: Herder, 1955), 144, fn 35) in place of τὸ γνωστόν. In my translation of sources in this paper, I have freely consulted existing translations and amended them where I have considered it appropriate.

[2] See, among others, Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie* (Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1961), 277-278; Lars Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor* (2nd edition, Chicago: Open Court, 1995), 31-32; Jean-Claude Larchet, *La divinisation de l'homme selon saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996), 376-382.

[3] *Or* 29.19; 40.45.

[4] *De inc.* 54.

[5] *Ad haer.* 3.19.1.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

incarnation, but of the ascetic life of the Christian.[6] The deification of the human person is directly proportionate to, and constituted by, the humanisation of the divine Word, who became incarnate historically in Christ. Deification takes place when the invisible God again takes on visible contours in the virtues, thereby becoming manifest in the world in an ongoing, escalating cycle of revelation. Love (ἀγάπη), which on the divine side is enacted in the form of φιλανθρωπία,[7] constitutes the essential ingredient that makes this transformative, unifying, and revelatory process possible.

But my primary interest in starting with this passage is not so much to point out this reciprocity than to note its transformational, *theophanous* effect upon the human body—an effect suggested by the words immediately following. Just prior to this passage, Maximus had described the spiritual *diabasis* of the soul from sense through reason up to mind, through which the saints become united 'wholly' to God. Then in the words that follow, he makes passing reference to the impact of this process upon 'the nature of the body'. '[A]ccording to this philosophy,' he writes, 'the nature of the body is necessarily ennobled (εὐγενίζεται).'[8] The person 'caught up' (ἁρπάζεσθαι) in the process of deification becomes in the ordered totality of his corporeal human nature—a composite unity of mind (νοῦς), reason (λόγος) and sense (αἴσθησις), an agent of divine manifestation.

It is this necessarily corporeal character and locus of divine theophany, one paralleled in scripture and cosmos, that I shall endeavour to explore further in this essay. In doing so, I wish to draw attention to the 'structural dynamics' of Maximus' account of revelation, that is, the overall shape of revelation as a progressive and interactive movement and the corresponding role of the symbolic and the sensible. This is a theme we encounter elsewhere in his *œuvre*, most notably in the great anti-Origenist work, *Ambiguum* 7,[9] where, among other things, Maximus is at pains to demon-

---

[6] *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.401AB); *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1084C); *Amb.Io.* 60 (PG 91.1385C); *Amb.Th.* 3 (PG 91.1040CD).

[7] In her important study *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), Catherine Osborne has demonstrated convincingly the association of φιλανθρωπία as it is understood by Origen and Dionysius the Areopagite with God's love exercised in the economy of the incarnation (164-200). Already in Origen she detects the presence of an 'inverse symmetry' between human assimilation to God through love and God's love for humankind (182), one that is not unlike the reciprocity involved in the *tantum-quantum* idea of Maximus.

[8] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1113C; see also PG 91.1116D).

[9] PG 91.1068D-1101C.

strate that it is precisely *within* the material structure and temporal contingencies of the cosmos that there can be discerned the providential and gracious presence of a good God. And while for illustrative purposes it will prove useful to draw upon insights from other material, especially the discussion of the account of the Transfiguration in *Ambiguum* 10—which is for Maximus paradigmatic of the totality of God's economic engagement with creation—I shall confine myself largely to Maximus' early work, the *Chapters on Theology and the Economy*,[10] for it consciously presents in pithy, accessible form the concentrated distillation of subjects addressed in the longer treatises.

1. *Apophasis and Kataphasis: the Structure of Revelation*

It seems prudent, when studying Maximus' *Chapters on Theology*—a work whose literary genre apparently favours the random conglomeration of unrelated parts—to begin by assuming its integrity as a unit before analysing its individual parts. But having said this, I should like to attempt to identify its primary theme by beginnning at its end. It is perhaps not so unusual to do so, since Maximus himself, adopting the Aristotelean teleological view of nature, habitually analysed the apparently endless diversity and chaotic randomness of the cosmos in terms of its ultimate unitive goal (*telos*).[11] And for all their theological, philosophical, and literary complexities, I would argue that these 200 diverse *capita* are united in their goal to lead their monastic readership to a stance of reverent praise and adoration in the face of the acknowledged incomprehensibility of God. It is the final three chapters, whose lines are replete with images of vocal praise and sensual experience of God, that leads me to suspect as much.

In 2.98, Maximus interprets the words of Psalm 101:1-2, 'I will sing and be wise in a blameless path when you come to me,' as that praise and experience of the divine advent that come about through ascetic struggle and gnostic understanding. In 2.99, having noted the dual necessity of keeping God's commands through both positive action ('goodness') and negative ('remembrance of the divine judgements'), Maximus introduces another Psalm verse, 'I will sing of your *mercy* and *judgement*, O Lord' (Psalm

---

[10] *Capita theologica et oeconomica*, hereon called the *Chapters on Theology* and abbreviated as *Th.Oec.* The Greek text is Migne's reprint in *Patrologia Graeca* of F. Combefis' 1675 edition (PG 90.1084-1173).

[11] *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1072BC); *Myst.* 1-2.

100:1), 'so that gladdened by *desire* he may address God, and being muzzled by *fear* he may be well-tuned for song.'[12] And finally in 2.100, the one who unites his body and soul through virtue and knowledge is said to become 'a lyre and flute and temple':

> A lyre, because he beautifully guards the harmony of the virtues; a flute, because through the divine visions he receives the Spirit's inspiration; and a temple since, by virtue of intellectual purity, he has become the Word's dwelling place.

Following his revered master Gregory Nazianzen, Maximus here affirms that the proper way to speak of God is not with chit-chat and conjecture, but with reverence and praise.[13] The psalter too, ends in praise, and there are echoes here of St Paul's doxology in Romans 11:33-36, for it is a similar kind of contemplation of God's acts of judgement and salvation that elicits the final doxological response. With this consummate doxological image of desire (πόθος) tempered and rendered harmonious by fear (φόβος),[14] it would be tantalising to see Maximus' purpose throughout the *Chapters on Theology* as being somehow conditioned by his desire to engage his readership in a spiritual enterprise that leads not to a theological agnosticism where one finally has nothing to say of God, but to that heavenly ἐξομολόγησις that is the true *telos* of the Christian life. If true, this would present a significant hermeneutical key for understanding Maximus' often-times radical apophaticism. It would suggest that negative theology functions as a presupposition whose purpose is affirmation and praise. It would suggest that there is something positive, substantial, even *corporeal* that belongs in an epistemological and ascetical schema often more well-known for negation and an almost iconoclastic suspicion of corporeality.

But that is not how the *Chapters on Theology* begin. Turning back now to the opening chapters, we are confronted at the outset by a series of ten

---

[12] In his translation, Berthold, I believe, misses the sense of the contrast in this passage between the effects of πόθος and φόβος (*Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings* (Classics of Western Spirituality, New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 170). Πόθος gives rise to intimacy and confidence; φόβος, in effecting silence and retreat, does not so much 'furnish a mouth' than 'silence the mouth.'

[13] Greg. Naz. *Or.* 27.1-5; 28.1-5. In *Q.Thal.* 55, Maximus allows conjecture only if it leads to one of two possibilities: praise and thanks, or reverent silence (*CCSG* 22, 481.26-483.36).

[14] Πόθος and φόβος are a favourite pair for Maximus that in unconfused union form the necessary characteristics of true love. See, for example, the opening paragraph of *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 27.8-28.29).

paragraphs of a strongly apophatic, philosophical character. Here Maximus furnishes an outline of the key assertions of a theological epistemology conditioned by negation (ἀπόφασις), thereby setting out the dominant themes he develops throughout the work:

> God is one, without beginning, incomprehensible, possessing in his totality the full power of being, fully excluding the notion of time and quality in that he is inaccessible to all and not discernible by any being on the basis of any natural representation.
>
> God is in himself (insofar as it is possible for us to know) neither beginning, nor middle, nor end, nor absolutely anything that is thought of as coming after him by nature; for he is unlimited, unmoved, and infinite in that he is infinitely beyond every essence, power, and act.[15]

As scholars have recognised since von Balthasar's analysis of the *Chapters on Theology* in his *Kosmische Liturgie*,[16] these opening ten chapters form a unit containing Maximus' forceful refutation of Origenist metaphysics, couched in the apophatic terminology of the two Gregories[17] and Pseudo-Dionysius.[18] With God as he is in himself, both ontological definitions and epistemological lines of enquiry fall short: the God who is beyond being is by definition also beyond knowing. Classic triads such as *beginning—middle—end*, or *essence—power—energy*, adapted from Aristotelean metaphysics, are ruled out as inadequate ways of speaking of God, who transcends all temporal, kinetic, and spatial categories.

We may be tempted by the complexity of the subject matter and the technicality of the vocabulary to think that we are dealing only with a rather abstract series of propositions on divine ontology and epistemology. Yet we cannot go beyond the first ten chapters without noting several features that pertain to our enquiry. First there is the use at the very end of the unit of Romans 11:36, 'from him and through him and to him are all things,' an affirmation which in its immediate setting suggests the inherently doxological goal of negative theology. One *can* speak of God as beginning, middle, and end—not in that he suffers (πάσχων) them in himself, but in that he effects (ἐνεργῶν) them in the things that have being. 'He is

---

[15] *Th.Oec.* 1.1-2.

[16] *Kosmische Liturgie*, 482-643. Also Sherwood, 'The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and His Refutation of Origenism', 106-109.

[17] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 28.3, 6, 9, 11, 17, 38; Greg. Nyss. *Contra Eunom.* 2.61, 105, 130, 142, 192; *De vita Moysis* 2.158, 162, 163, 180, 188.

[18] *De divinis nominibus* (*DN*) 1 (PG 3.588A; 588C); *Ep.* 1 (PG 3.1065A); *Ep.* 2 (PG 3.1068A-1069A).

beginning as creator, middle as provider, and end as final boundary, for as it says, "from him, and through him, and to him are all things."'[19] The doxological formula substantiates a theological *affirmation*.

What allows Maximus to affirm something of the God who transcends all positive affirmation? We must remember that he was thoroughly acquainted with, and indeed, directly utilising the theological apophaticism anticipated by the Cappadocians,[20] and expressed unequivocally in Dionysius:

> His transcendent darkness remains hidden from all light and concealed from all knowledge. Someone beholding God and understanding what he saw has not actually seen God himself but rather something of his which has being and which is knowable. For he himself utterly transcends mind and being. He is completely unknown and non-existent. He exists beyond being and is known beyond the mind.[21]

The answer to our question surely lies in pointing out that only when Maximus has fully *denied* the possibility of any natural means of access to knowledge of God on the one hand, and the inherent limitations of that believing brought about by the contemplation of the *logoi* in creation on the other, is he able to introduce the possibility of faith which, as a divine gift, gains access to the unknowable God in a way that far transcends all natural faculties:[22]

> It is said that all beings are objects of knowledge because they bear the demonstrable principles of their knowledge. God, however, is called the unknown, and among all knowable things he is believed only 'to be'. That is why no knowable object can compare in any way with him.

---

[19] *Th.Oec.* 1.10; Rom 11:36a.

[20] This statement comes with the qualification that the presence of apophaticism in the Cappadocians, particularly Gregory of Nyssa, ought not to be underestimated. See Robert Brightman, 'Apophatic Theology and Divine Infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa.' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 18 (1973), 97-114. One may also consider the rise of anchoritic monasticism in the 4th century a kind of dramatic parallel of the increasing emergence of a Christian consciousness that theology-as-prayer is properly articulated and lived out only within the tension—eschatologically oriented—created by negation and affirmation. See further Kallistos Ware, 'The Way of the Ascetics: Positive or Negative?' in Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis (eds.), *Asceticism* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 3-15.

[21] *Ep.* 1 (PG 3.1065AB).

[22] Von Balthasar observes that Maximus' high estimation of πίστις in these chapters is demonstrable in that he calls it 'authentic knowledge' (ἀληθὴς γνῶσις), going beyond Dionysius' conception of faith as that which revolves around knowledge of all things (*Kosmische Liturgie*, 605-606).

> The knowledge of beings includes naturally, in view of demonstration, knowledge of their own principles which naturally circumscribe them in a definition. But God, through the principles in beings, is believed only 'to be'. He gives to the godly a proper confession and faith which are clearer than every demonstration. For faith is a true knowledge which bears the undemonstrated principles, since it is the concrete actuality (ὑπόστασις) of realities that are beyond mind and reason.[23]

Viewed then within its wider setting in the *Chapters on Theology*, the exclamation from Romans 11:36 does more than simply connect doxology with κατάφασις. It is only on the basis of faith—which as the first step in the Pauline triad leads through hope to its perfection in love[24]—that one can and indeed must speak of God within the limitations of human speech. God's inscrutability leads to confession and praise. *Apophasis* and *kataphasis* are two sides of the same coin.[25]

This fact is further demonstrated by way of a second observation made by George Berthold when he noted the almost creedal form of this opening section in its use of the confession 'God is one'.[26] Later we find the exact repetition of this phrase in a passage that qualifies the strong apophaticism of 1.1-10 with an overtly trinitarian confession.[27] Has Maximus in this second semi-creedal formulation again abandoned the primacy of the *via negativa*? Given the deliberate placement of the paragraph that follows, it would appear that he wants to hold both affirmation and negation together in inseparable unity:

> Every concept involves those who think and what is thought, subject and object. But God is neither of those who think nor of what is thought for he is beyond them. Otherwise he would be limited if as a thinker he stood in need of the relationship to what was thought or as an object of thought he would naturally lapse to the level of subject thinking through a relationship. Thus there remains only the rejoinder that *God is neither of those things that conceive, nor of those things that are conceived, but is beyond [all] these things.*[28]

---

[23] *Th.Oec.* 1.8-9. Cf. Hebrews 11:1.

[24] See *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.396BC).

[25] On this point, it is interesting to note the use of Romans 11:33-36 in Dionysius (*DN* 1.2; 4.9; 7.1; *Ep.* 5). God's unknowability is an attribute worthy of praise.

[26] 'The Cappadocian Roots of Maximus the Confessor', in Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn (eds.), *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980* (Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1982), 55.

[27] *Th.Oec.* 2.1. See further, 'The Cappadocian Roots', 55-56.

[28] *Th.Oec.* 2.2.

What we seem to be encountering at the beginning of both sets of 100 chapters is a paradoxical dialectic between affirmation and negation, one that itself reflects the interplay and inherent connection between *theologia* and *economia*.[29] Human reason stands before God speechless, for he is beyond all knowing and speculation. He is neither subject or object, and therefore not only is he beyond human scrutiny as object, but also beyond the status of subject as one who addresses and acts upon humans as objects. The impact of this utter ineffability of God extends even to the super-human creatures, including the angels, and completely excludes any mediated accessibility in the form of emanation. As Maximus asserts in a later passage, 'The knowledge of [God] in himself, both in essence (οὐσία) and person (ὑπόστασις), remains inaccessible to all angels and humans alike: he is unknown to anyone by any means.'[30]

This primary epistemological impasse confronts the would-be contemplative with shocking force. Negative theology is discovered to be a spiritual experience rather than an epistemological method.[31] It is Maximus' intention to bring that experience about in his readers, for the *sententiae* form of the *Chapters on Theology* is essentially interactive and performative in nature, designed in structure and use not so much to provide philosophical data, as to lead to transfiguring engagement with the God hidden in *theologia* and revealed in *economia*. It is the paradoxical reciprocity between denial of God's knowability on the one hand, and affirmation of his knowability through faith on the other that Maximus commends as the

---

[29] Andrew Louth refers to the same dynamic at work in his analysis of the *Mystagogia* and *Ambiguum* 10: 'The movement between apophatic and kataphatic is not a matter of a dialectic between two kinds of human logic in speaking of God; rather, it is a movement between God's own hidden life and his engagement with his creation. . . .' (*Wisdom of the Byzantine Church: Evagrios of Pontos and Maximos the Confessor* (Jill Raitt (ed.), 1997 Paine Lectures in Religion, Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri), 42. While I concur with Ysabel De Andia who argues that, in contrast to Dionysius, Maximus posits a far more christocentric relation between negative and affirmative theology, *theologia* and *economia* ('Transfiguration et Théologie Négative Chez Maxime le Confesseur et Denys L'Aréopagite', in Ysabel de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa Postérité en Orient et en Occident. Actes du Colloque International. Paris, 21-24 septembre 1994* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes), 309), I feel that her contrasts are drawn rather too sharply.

[30] *Th.Oec.* 2.76.

[31] Pierre Hadot draws a similar conclusion for Greek philosophy in general when he says that 'it is mystical experience that founds negative theology, not the reverse.' Quoted by Arnold I. Davidson in Arnold I. Davidson (ed.) and Michael Chase (trans.), *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995), 29.

basic structure of divine revelation, and thus the presupposition of all true ascetic transformation. Yet it is not only the start, as we have seen, but also the way. As Berthold puts it, '. . . the revelation of God as Trinity is one which both reduces the human mind to apophatic silence and calls it to a life of divine intimacy.'[32] It seems that Maximus wants his readers to understand the ascetic life as a continual movement of increasing illumination in union with, and in praise of the economic trinity, by means of negation, disillusionment, and unknowing.

So far we have traced the outline of a structure of revelation in Maximus' *Chapters on Theology* that closely conforms to the pattern of divine descent and ascent by way of affirmation and negation in the Areopagite. Maximus envisages the ascetic life in terms of an ongoing engagement between these paradoxes of negation and affirmation, of a theological unknowing and an economic knowing, of ignorance and faith, of silence and praise. Between these poles we discern a basic pattern of thinking, and, more than that, a pattern of the human (non)experience of the divine. This in turn leads us to ask how this pattern works itself out in the Christian life. The *Chapters on Theology* outline a basic structure of revelation. But where and how does this two-way structure intersect corporeal human existence? What does it look like? What are its 'corporeal contours'—that is, its modes and media? In answering this question, we come now to qualify more carefully the place and function of corporeality within a revelatory framework characterised by negation and affirmation.

2. *Revelation as Interactive Process*

Perhaps the best place to start for an understanding of how revelation works out in human experience is not with Maximus at all, but with Dionysius the Areopagite. In Dionysius we have already encountered a multi-dimensional understanding of revelation built around the twin doxological actions of affirmation and negation. Dionysius calls it the 'double way' of sacred revelation.[33] To these ways there correspond a number of elements, largely expressed in categories borrowed from Neoplatonism: procession and return, descent and ascent, diffusion and union. But far from forming a dry, metaphysical system, these categories are employed to describe a pedagogical process that has its initiative and power in the benevolence of God:

---

[32] 'The Cappadocian Roots', 58.

[33] *De caelesti hierarchia* (*CH*) 2.3.

> Many scripture writers will tell you that the divinity is not only invisible and incomprehensible, but also 'unsearchable and inscrutable', since there is not a trace for anyone who would reach through into the hidden depths of this infinity. And yet, on the other hand, the Good is not absolutely incommunicable to everything. By itself it generously reveals a firm, transcendent beam, granting enlightenments proportionate to each being, and thereby draws sacred minds upward to its permitted contemplation, to participation and to the state of becoming like it. What happens to those that rightly and properly make this effort is this. They do not venture toward an impossibly daring sight of God, one beyond what is duly granted them. Nor do they go tumbling downward where their own natural inclinations would take them. No. Instead they are raised firmly and unswervingly upward in the direction of the ray which enlightens them. With a love matching the illuminations granted them, they take flight, reverently, wisely, in all holiness.[34]

This paragraph directs us toward a conception of revelation as an interactive dialectic that heads towards the re-unification of both divine and human subjects. Inherent to this dialectic is the paradoxical nature of revelation. God reveals himself by hiding himself, and in hiding himself, he is known. In this sense, we can never speak of revelation without also speaking of concealment.[35]

Turning to Maximus, we find similar aspects present in his thought. We have already observed the dynamism inherent in the dialectic of affirmation and negation with its accompanying paradox of revelation and concealment. Both give shape to a progressive movement of the Logos that proceeds downwards and outwards into creation, draws creation into its movement through man, and then culminates in return towards the unity of the Godhead. It is a movement from unity to diversity and back to unity; from simplicity to complexity back to simplicity.[36] Yet it becomes clear in Maximus that, in opposition to the equilibrium implied in the Origenist pristine and final states, the final dynamic state of unity and simplicity is quite different from the first, for restored and deified human nature contains within itself the healed, reconciled fragments of creation, united to God in infinite, perpetual progress.[37]

---

[34] *DN* 1.2 (trans. by Colm Luibheid, in Colm Luibheid and Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist press, 1987), 50).

[35] See Dionysius *CH* 2.2; *Ep.* 3; Maximus *Amb.Th.* 5 (PG 91.1049A).

[36] This theme is expounded upon at length in *Amb.Io.* 10 (*PG* 91.1177B-1180A) in which Maximus draws upon the Aristotelean categories of expansion (διαστολή) and contraction (συστολή) to describe a movement in being from universals, to particulars, and back to universals.

[37] *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1089B); 41 (PG 91.1304D-1305B); *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.404D). See

Creation then can be seen, on the basis of its penetration by the Logos, to be a central and crucial entity in this revelatory movement. It is precisely as, or *because* material creation is 'caught up' as an object of potential union with the Logos that its role as a medium of divine revelation becomes possible.[38] That which the Logos penetrates in order to unify with himself necessarily becomes an agent of the revelatory process. Creation constitutes the 'stuff' of revelation, and therefore we must add, of *concealment.* To those without eyes to see, creation hides God. To this is connected, on equal par, Maximus' understanding of scripture. Creation and scripture—the natural and historical laws—are symbolised for Maximus by the shining garments of the transfigured Christ, rendered transparent to the purified vision of the three apostles.[39] Paul Blowers has convincingly demonstrated this in his study of *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, concluding that Maximus 'envisions creation and scripture as objective economies of divine revelation that stand in a perfect analogous relation to the Logos-Revealer.'[40] Yet Maximus does not extend to creation a lesser role than scripture in the revelatory structure. As he asserts in *Ambiguum* 10, 'the two laws—both the natural law and the written law—are of equal honour and teach the same things; neither is greater or less than the other.'[41] Or as Blowers has it, 'nature and history are equal poles that complement one another eschatologically.'[42]

Since the unknowability of God forms the basic presupposition of theological knowledge, by which we mean not simply knowledge *that* God is, but the knowledge of faith that leads to union with him, then the initiative and sustaining power of the revelatory process must reside in God. If the fallen human mind has no access to knowledge of God, then it is entirely dependent upon God's self-revelation for its knowledge and apprehension of him. But God's point of access to the human mind, if we can speak this way, is not direct—at least not in the first instance. As we have shown above, the revelatory movement of the Logos is mediated via created, sensible realities: nature and history.

---

further Paul Plass, 'Moving Rest in Maximus the Confessor', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 35 (1984), 177-190; Paul M. Blowers, 'Maximus the Confessor, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Concept of "Perpetual Progress"', *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992), 151-171.

[38] God's great works and providence, evident in creation, function as mirrors of divine goodness, wisdom, and power. See *Car.* 1.96.

[39] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128A-D).

[40] *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy in Maximus the Confessor: An Investigation of the* Quaestiones ad Thalassium, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 102.

[41] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128D).

[42] *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 102.

The following passage speaks of revelation in terms of divine action: condescension, lifting up, and illumination. That comes as no surprise. But in view of what we have said, it is the tactility of this encounter that is worthy of note:

> The soul would never be able to reach out and attain to the knowledge of God, *unless God himself*, having drawn near to it, touch (ἅψηται) it by condescension and lead it up to himself; for the human mind has no such power to ascend, to apprehend any divine illumination as it were, *unless God himself* draw it up—as [far as] the human mind is able to be drawn up—and [himself] illumine it with divine brightness.[43]

Here again we detect the familiar movement of divine descent and human ascent, which constitutes the basic structure of revelation. Primary is the necessity of God's condescension (συγκατάβασις), whereby 'God himself' comes near and 'touches' the soul. The reference is deliberately incarnational, yet it is expressed here not as a historically distant event, but as an intimate encounter in the flesh and blood life of a member of the Christian community. Through this touch, God leads the soul back up (ἀνάγειν) to himself—its true source and goal. The use of the word ἀνάγειν in this context is to be noted, as it often occurs in Dionysius coupled with 'return' (ἐπιστροφή), and plays an important role in the Areopagite's understanding of the human ascent to God by means of the symbolic revelatory media.[44]

To summarise, the fulfilment of revelation as a process is the result of a progressive, and dynamic engagement between the Logos as the source and agent of illumination and the receptive human mind in ordered harmony within the context of the economies of creation and scripture. The initial point of contact between divine and human subjects is sensible, mediate, and diverse. The final state of union to which the process leads is intelligible, immediate, and simple.

3. *The Incarnation and the Apprehension of Revelation*

We come now to consider more specifically the place of the incarnate Logos in this scheme. It is in Maximus' meditations on the synoptic account of the Transfiguration that we can trace most clearly his dialectical theol-

---

[43] *Th.Oec.* 1.31.

[44] See further Paul Rorem, *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984), 99-105.

ogy of revelation at work. The following section from *Ambiguum* 10 demonstrates his thinking on the event.[45]

> While I do not wish to appear to any more long-winded than is necessary, I think that there appears to us yet another great and divine mystery from [this account of] the divine Transfiguration, more radiant than what I have said before. I think that the divine-fitting drama (τὰ θεοπρεπῆ δραματουργήματα) enacted upon the mountain of Transfiguration mystically demonstrates (ὑφηγεῖσθαι) the two universal modes of theology.[46]

Maximus does not at this point mention the Logos. It seems that his aim is initially to provide an outline of the structure of revelation that serves to instruct his readers into the proper way of apprehending the mystery of Christ. The two 'modes' are already familiar to us. First he sets out the way of negation, which paradoxically 'affirms' (καταφάσκειν) and 'amplifies' (σεμνύνειν) the divine transcendence: '[First there is] the antecedent and simple and uncaused, which through singular and total negation truly affirms the divine, and which through speechlessness necessarily amplifies its transcendence.' Then follows the way of affirmation, in which we discern the necessary place of the corporeal and symbolic: '[Then there is] that which follows this and is composite, which through affirmation magnificently sketches out [the divine] from those things that are caused.'[47] His conclusion affirms the integrity of both apophatic and kataphatic theology as a bi-unitive whole: 'By these, as far as it is humanly possible, the overarching knowledge about God and the divine things leads us through the symbols suitably adapted to us to both these modes [of theology].'[48]

---

[45] It should be noted that by supplementing Maximus' treatment of the Transfiguration in the *Chapters on Theology* with this examination of *Ambiguum* 10, I am aware of the danger of conflating two quite distinct expressions of thought in Maximus on the role of Christ in revelation. Polycarp Sherwood has dated the two works as nearly contemporaneous (the earlier *Ambigua* c. 628-30; *Chapters of Theology* c. 630-34; see 'An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor,' *Studia Anselmiana* 30 (Rome: Herder, 1952), 31-35). Nevertheless, it is in *Ambiguum* 10, far more definitively than in the *Chapters on Theology*, that Maximus asserts the centrality of the incarnate Logos as the focal paradigm and means of a universal divine revelation, to the extent that, as Andrew Louth indicates, 'in the Incarnate One, all the forms of God's revelation are summed up and become comprehensible.' (*Maximus the Confessor* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 71.)

[46] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165B).

[47] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165B).

[48] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165BC).

Using terminology that is frequently repeated in his other discussions on the Transfiguration, Maximus goes on to speak of the didactic and educative nature of knowledge gained through material symbols.[49] We have come across this pedagogical aspect of revelation with Dionysius in the previous section. Far from being a peripheral issue, the pedagogical character and purpose of revelation could be said to constitute a dominant motif. We detect this fact as Maximus applies this two-fold dialectical structure of revelation, pedagogically conceived, to Christ:

> Let us consider whether in each of the above-mentioned modes the symbol is appropriately and wisely constituted according to that divine Transfiguration of the Lord. For he accepted to be created in form like us without change, and through his immeasurable love for humankind (φιλανθρωπία) to become the type and symbol of himself, and from himself symbolically to exemplify himself, and through his appearing to lead the whole creation to himself [in his] invisible and complete hiddenness. And while he remains quite unknown in his hidden, secret place beyond all things, unable to be known or understood by any being in any way whatsoever, out of his love for humankind (φιλανθρώπως) he grants to human beings intimations of himself in the manifest divine works (τὰς θεουργίας) performed through the flesh.[50]

In the *Chapters on Theology*, we recognise the same scheme at work. As the φιλάνθρωπος,[51] the Logos initially gives himself to people according to their limited, sense-oriented means of apprehension. Thus Maximus says that the 'first encounter' (πρώτη προσβολή) with the Logos is with his flesh—with his incarnate, veiled form.[52] The reference occurs within a rather profound series of chapters that meditate upon the contrast between the Lord's presence and absence experienced respectively as 'face to face' vision and vision 'as in a mirror' (1 Corinthians 13:12).[53] Maximus considers each of these categories in connection with the progression from the active to the contemplative life.

> The Lord is sometimes absent, sometimes present. He is absent in terms of face to face vision; he is present in terms of vision in a mirror and in enigmas.

---

[49] Παιδεύειν with its cognates dominates the educative vocabulary in Maximus' exegesis of scripture. See, for example, *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128A; 1160D-1161A). Significantly, the verbs παιδεύειν and διδάσκειν are often juxtaposed with, and therefore appear to occupy an equivalent semantic field to verbs of demonstration and visual manifestation (δείκνυμι, ἐπιφαίνομαι, ὑφηγέομαι).

[50] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165D-1168A).

[51] *Th.Oec.* 2.56. See also *Q.Thal.* 48 (PG 90.433B).

[52] *Th.Oec.* 2.60.

[53] *Th.Oec.* 2.57-61.

> To the active person, the Lord is present through the virtues, but absent to him who takes no account of the reason of virtue. And again, to the contemplative he is present through the true knowledge of the things that are, but absent to him who somehow misses it.[54]

The apprehension of the Lord, even by dim reflection, is conditioned by the spiritual state and progress of the subject. The manifestation of the Logos is not univocal. It is, crassly put, personally tailored according to the receptivity of the human party in such a way as to advance them from knowledge of the Logos' flesh to knowledge of his 'glory'.[55]

As one ascends the progressive steps of the spiritual life from letter to spirit, from words to the Word, and, given the context, we can add from *praxis*[56] to *theoria*, one moves from dependence upon material symbols to a more direct apprehension of the subject they disclose. Indeed, 'the saints', that is, the characters and writers of scripture, represent the highest way of apprehending divine knowledge when it is said of them that 'they do not acquire the blessed knowledge of God only by sense and appearances and forms, using letters and syllables, which lead to mistakes and bafflement over the judgement of the truth, but solely by the mind, rendered most pure and released from all material mists.'[57]

In following Maximus' distinctions between various levels or stages in the revelatory process, we must keep in mind the integrative unity between the two realms of *praxis* and *theoria*, a unity Maximus repeatedly asserts over against an unhealthy preoccupation with one to the exclusion of the other. In 2.37-39 for instance, Maximus makes a point he demonstrates more fully elsewhere,[58] namely, the essential co-inherence of the ascetic and contemplative dimensions of the spiritual life.[59] He links them

---

[54] *Th.Oec.* 2.57-58.

[55] *Th.Oec.* 2.61.

[56] By the term *praxis*, Maximus invariably has in mind ascetic struggle in its Palestinian and Byzantine monastic forms. Following Evagrius the primary term is πρακτική.

[57] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1160B).

[58] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1145AB); *Amb.Io.* 57 (PG 91.1380D-1381B); *Q.Thal.* 3 (*CCSG* 7, 55.17-22); *Q.Thal.* 58 (PG 90.596A): 'In my view, practice (πρᾶξις) and contemplation (θεωρία) mutually cohere with each other, and the one is never separated from the other; on the contrary, practice shows forth through conduct the knowledge derived from contemplation, while contemplation, no less than reason, fortifies itself with the virtue derived from practice.' (trans. by Paul M. Blowers, *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 134.)

[59] This principle surfaces repeatedly in the *Chapters on Theology*. See, for instance, 1.98; 2.32; 2.37; 2.40; 2.51; 2.64; 2.74; 2.80; 2.87.

respectively with the two epistemological categories of *kataphasis* and *apophasis*, which in turn are aspects of the self-manifestation of the Word in the flesh on the one hand, and the *transitus* from the Word-made-flesh to the spiritual Word in its pre-incarnate form on the other:

> In the active life, the Word—becoming thick by means of the virtues—becomes flesh. Whereas in the contemplative life—becoming lean by spiritual thoughts, it becomes what it was in the beginning: God the Word.
>
> He makes the Word flesh who engages in the ethical teaching of the Word through more elementary examples and words in view of the corresponding potential of the hearers; and again, he makes the Word spirit who expounds mystical theology through sublime visions.
>
> He who makes theological affirmations kataphatically makes the Word flesh—having nothing other than what can be seen or felt in order to know God as cause. But he who makes theological negations apophatically makes the Word spirit, as in the beginning he was God and was with God—having absolutely nothing of what can be known, [yet] knowing well the unknowable.

At the same time, there remains an ordered tension between the two dimensions of *praxis/theoria*, flesh/spirit, kataphaticism/apophaticism, and in the two chapters that follow, Maximus warns against a carnal sensuality severed from its proper *taxis*.[60] Both dimensions are seen to exist in a natural harmony only within a dynamic order of priority in which *praxis* is subordinate to *theoria*, affirmation to negation, the sensible to the spiritual. This order has as its paradigm the historical descent and return of the divine Word, in which is manifest the salvific nature of the movement from affirmation to negation towards teleological unity.

The clear *theological* priority of *theoria* over *praxis* also seems to have its basis in the thought that *theoria* is the realm towards which *praxis* naturally heads.[61] In other words, the relation between the two dimensions, as with the relation between letter and spirit in Scripture and sensible and insensible in creation, is viewed eschatologically.[62] This perspective is shaped by

---

[60] *Th.Oec.* 2.41-42.

[61] While thoroughly conditioned by eschatological considerations, this priority is not to be thought of in chronological and temporal terms. Rather it may be seen as an extension of an ontological priority in Platonism of the spiritual and simple over the material and composite. See the important comments of Cornelia J. De Vogel in her essay 'Platonism and Christianity: a Mere Antagonism or a Profound Common Ground?', *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), 25-26.

[62] This is not at all dissimilar to the Pauline distinction between the outer/visible and inner/invisible life in 2 Corinthians 4:16-18, the first of which is temporal, the latter of which is eternal, though already apprehended under the form of tribulation.

the nature of the incarnation of the Logos himself, discussed in the first paragraph below, and by the nature of its apprehension, discussed in the second:

> The Word of God is called flesh not only as having become incarnate, but in the manner of being understood simply as God the Word 'in the beginning with God' the Father, where, possessing both clear and naked forms of the truth about all things, he does not contain parables or riddles or have need of allegorical stories. When he becomes present to people who are unable to apprehend naked thoughts with naked intelligence, he 'becomes flesh' by presenting himself through the multiplicity of stories and riddles and parables and dark sayings. For in the first encounter (κατὰ τὴν πρώτην προσβολήν), our mind does not apprehend the naked Word, but the Word incarnate, indeed, in a multiplicity of verbal forms, for while he is Word by nature, he is flesh to the sight. The result is that the multitude (οἱ πολλοί) think they see 'flesh' and not the Word, even though he truly is the Word. For the inner meaning of Scripture (ὁ νοῦς τῆς Γραφῆς) is not what appears to the multitude, but something contrary to appearance (ἕτερον παρὰ τὸ δοκοῦν). For the Word 'becomes flesh' through each individual word.
>
> The beginning of human discipleship towards devotion generates the movement towards flesh. For in the first encounter (τὴν πρώτην προσβολήν) towards godliness we associate with the letter, but not the spirit. But gradually progressing in the spirit, cutting down the thickness of the words by more refined contemplations, we come to be purely in the pure Christ, as far as humanly possible. Then we can say with the Apostle, 'And if we have known Christ according to the flesh, we no longer know him', clearly meaning that due to the simple encounter with the Logos apart from the veils of the mind, we advance from knowing the Logos of 'flesh' to knowing his 'glory' as the only begotten from the Father.[63]

In typical Platonic fashion, Maximus distinguishes between true vision and the illusion of *hoi polloi*. True vision sees through externalities presented by the riddles and verbal forms of scripture to the 'naked Word' enclosed in them. The 'inner meaning' or 'mind'[64] of scripture is 'contrary to appearances'. Here we see the double-entendre of the incarnation noted earlier: the Word is concealed in revelation, and revealed in concealment.[65] The initial vision of individual words of scripture or the flesh of Christ presents only those material and sensible forms with which the naked Word has wrapped himself, not the Word himself. This is not simply an act of 'hide

---

[63] *Th.Oec.* 2.60-61.

[64] In *Th.Oec.* 2.60 the term is νοῦς; elsewhere Maximus also uses λόγος, θεωρία, σκοπός.

[65] See esp. *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1129C).

and seek' on his part, but the means by which he renders himself accessible to those who are unable to apprehend naked νοητά with their naked νοῦς. It is also the means by which he protects from defilement by the impure the mysterious sanctity of the content of revelation.[66] But the driving force behind each action is love, salvifically directed.

The passages studied here have made clear what could be called the notion of 'proportionate revelation.' Maximus is simply reflecting the basic patristic consensus reaching back to Origen,[67] and ultimately, to the scriptures, that divine gifts are distributed proportionately to each believer in a measure commensurate to their spiritual state. But followers of Christ are not simply neutral recipients of a proportionate revelation tailored to their spiritual or intellectual capacities. The divine gift—whether it be spoken of as faith, vision, grace, adoption—must be acted upon, put to work, exercised, guarded and preserved. At one point we find Maximus tracing the necessary movement from Christ's crucifixion through the tomb to resurrection. These events of the triduum are re-lived existentially in the ascetic progress of the saints. In a mysterious way, Christians hold in their hands the power either to crucify or to raise Christ, depending on the level of their progression in the spiritual life from *praxis* to *theoria*.[68] This is not to conclude that revelation is simply what one makes of it. Continual and progressive passage from flesh to spirit, from *praxis* to *theoria* is a both a moral and theological imperative in response to and in co-operation with the divine initiative.

One final example of the unified yet necessarily progressive nature of the anagogical process of apprehension at work is in order. Here Maximus begins by stating the problem in a way that suggests his solutions will head along trinitarian, or at least binitarian lines:

> As long we continue to see the Word of God embodied by means of riddles in the letter of holy Scripture, we have not beheld noetically the incorporeal and simple and singular and only Father as in the incorporeal and simple

---

[66] This is a dominant motif in Dionysius. See, for example, *CH* 2.2.

[67] *Contra Celsum* II.72: 'For the divine voice is such that it is heard only by those whom the speaker wishes to hear it. . . . And since when God speaks He does not want His voice to be audible to all, a man who has superior hearing hears God, whereas a man who has become hard of hearing in his soul does not perceive that God is speaking.' (trans. by Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), 121-122.) Also, on seeing/knowing God only by means of revelation and divine grace, see *Contra Celsum* VII. 42-44.

[68] *Th.Oec.* 2.27-30; 1.54; 1.59-67. Cf. Hebrews 6:6.

> and singular and only Son, as in the passage, 'he who has seen me has seen the Father,' and, 'I am in the Father and the Father is in me.'[69]

What, concretely, does it mean to 'see the Word of God embodied by means of riddles in the letter of holy scripture'? Maximus is clearly addressing an interpretive error, but the context suggests that its basic manifestation lies in the realm of the spiritual life. Over-preoccupation with *praxis* to the exclusion of *theoria* is evidence of a literalistic reading of scripture and the subsequent misapprehension of the Word disclosed and hidden there. Yet Maximus does not propose to do away with the letter of scripture, nor its correlatives: *praxis* and the flesh of Christ. To be sure, according to the principle of the incarnation, they constitute and remain the essential first step in the human ascent to God. He continues:

> Therefore, the need for further understanding is such that we must first pass through the veils of the letters that surround the Word, and thereby with a naked mind behold the pure Word himself as he exists in himself—as the one who clearly shows forth the Father in himself—as far as humanly possible. It is necessary for him who piously seeks after God not to hold fast to the letter, lest he unwittingly take words about God in place of God, that is, in place of the Word—precariously being content with the *words* of Scripture, while the *Word* escapes the mind through holding fast to the garments, all the while thinking it has the incorporeal Word. And like the Egyptian woman who took hold not of Joseph, but of his clothes, those who remain in the beauty alone of visible phenomena unwittingly worship in the manner of the ancients the creation instead of the Creator.[70]

It is appropriate at this point to try to summarise the main points of this section. The examples from Maximus elucidated above demonstrate the function of the pedagogical program of the Logos whereby he adapts himself to human beings at a level conducive to their intellectual (spiritual) capacities.[71] As we have seen, this is also where the human subject's involvement in the revelatory movement begins. If the involvement of the Logos is characterised by *pedagogy*, the involvement of the human person is char-

---

[69] *Th.Oec.* 2.73.

[70] *Th.Oec.* 2.73. The incident from Genesis 39:12 is utilised in a similar context in *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1133A). There the discussion revolves around the relation between divine revelation and concealment through corresponding means: creation, the words of holy scripture, the flesh of Christ, and his garments on the Mount of Transfiguration. These means are precisely that: means that are inseparable from, but not to be equated with, the content hidden and manifest in them.

[71] This thought is developed at length in a passage in *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1133A).

acterised by *anagogy*. By means of *anagogy*, one progresses from this 'fleshly' encounter with the Logos, which is not actually (finally) the Logos at all but with that which veils and covers his naked, pure form, and moves in stages of progressive disillusionment to the apprehension of the Logos as he is in his glorified form, as God, and as he was 'with God' before the creation of the world.[72] This movement is evident in a number of paradigms, all given definitive shape in the incarnation. They include the movement from the letter (ῥῆματα) or flesh (σάρξ) of scripture to its spirit, or meaning (λόγος), or mind (νοῦς); the movement from the active life to the contemplative;[73] from attention to the human and sensible to the divine and insensible;[74] verbal discourse to wordless contemplation;[75] from being beginners to being perfect. These anagogical movements also find a parallel in the historical movement from Old Testament to New Testament. Yet it is always a case of holding these dimensions together. Just as one never 'graduates' from ascetic struggle so that it no longer plays any part in the contemplative life, so one is never able to do without the Word made flesh, the letter of scripture, the cross and tomb. These, of course, are not the final (teleological) reality: they veil or conceal what is finally only made manifest in the Spirit, in the meaning of scripture, in the resurrection and ascension, and in the final consummation. The latter are hidden in and under the former as under types and symbols.[76] Yet they remain with the naked, glorified Logos, just as Moses and Elijah remain alongside Jesus in his transfiguration.[77]

As we have been studying the movement from apprehending the Word in the 'flesh' to knowing him in his 'glory', it has been possible also to detect lines suggesting answers to the question concerning the final goal or aim of revelation. We shall now explore this further.

---

[72] John 1:1.

[73] *Th.Oec.* 1.99.

[74] *Th.Oec.* 2.18.

[75] *Th.Oec.* 1.83.

[76] It is worth adding in this connection the observation of I.-H. Dalmais that '[e]n préférant la dialectique préparation-réalisation à l'antithèse figure-réalité, Maxime se donne le double avantage de nouer plus fortement l'unité de sa synthèse en y introduisant explicitement la dimension de la durée, et de réserver une place au devenir à l'intérieur de la nouvelle Alliance.' ('La Manifestation du Logos dans L'Homme et dans L'Église: Typologie anthropologique et typologie ecclésiale d'après *Qu.Thal.* 60 et *la Mystagogie*', in Heinzer and Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur*, 21. This is to be seen in congruity with the unification in Maximus of an historical-eschatological and a metaphysical interpretive framework.

[77] *Th.Oec.* 2.14.

4. *Theologia and Doxologia: The Goal of Revelation*

We began the first chapter of this essay by investigating the doxological character of theological (non)knowledge of the transcendent God. Now towards the end we return to that theme, following the structure of revelation marked for us by Maximus' own theological vision. In the previous section we have seen how, in a series of chapters that have already formed the object of some attention,[78] Maximus deals with the interrelated movements from *praxis* to *theoria*, from letter to spirit, from flesh to glory, from partial to full vision.

In 2.18, a passage noted for its roots in Origen,[79] Maximus presents a summary of the spiritual *anabasis* to God. Taking as his starting point the Pauline phrases 'from strength to strength' and 'from glory to glory' (2 Corinthians 3:18), Maximus likens the necessity of lifting one's soul and mind in prayer from human to divine realities to the necessity of continual *progress* (προκοπή) in the practice of the virtues, *advancement* (ἐπανάβασις) in the spiritual knowledge of contemplation, and *transferral* (μετάβασις)[80] from the letter of scripture to the spirit. 'In this way,' he says,

> the mind will be able to follow the One who 'passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God' (Hebrews 4:14), who is everywhere and who has passed through (διεληλυθότι) all things in the economy on our behalf, so that following him, we also may pass through (διέλθωμεν) all things with him, and may come to be with him (πρὸς αὐτὸν),[81] if, that is, we perceive him not according to the limitations of his economic condescension, but according to the majestic splendour of his natural infinitude.[82]

---

[78] *Th.Oec.* 2.73-78.

[79] *De princ.* 2.11.6; see von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie*, 561.

[80] In connection with this passage or ascent of the soul/mind to God (see also *Th.Oec.* 2.77), Blowers (*Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 96-97) notes the prevalence of compounds of the verb -βαίνω (ἀνα-, δια-, μετα-, ἐπανα-). He advances the conjecture that Maximus uses these terms 'because they can convey for him both a sense of *transcendence*—in keeping with the need to "pass over," or to "ascend beyond," sensible objects and the passions which they can spark—and yet also the crucial sense of *continuity*, namely, the necessity of first "passing through" or "penetrating" sensible objects en route to the intelligible or spiritual truth that inheres, by grace, in those sensible things.'

[81] The use of the preposition πρός by the Fathers when speaking of location and movement with respect to God, often reflects its very deliberate use in John's gospel (e.g. John 1:1-2; 14:11) where it signifies the unique and close proximity of the Word/Son with God the Father, and human participation in that proximity.

[82] '. . . ἐάν γε νοῶμεν αὐτόν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν σμικρότητα τῆς οἰκονομικῆς συγκαταβάσεως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν μεγαλειότητα τῆς φυσικῆς ἀοριστίας.'

The proximity indicated by the preposition πρός indicates a participation in the Son of God that brings the human subject, by grace, into that same relation with the Father enjoyed by the Son himself by nature. The intimacy is of a communal kind, ecclesial as well as binitarian. Having shown how in the descent and ascent of the Logos the whole destiny of man was typified,[83] Maximus speaks of humankind's final destiny with him before the Father, where 'God will be "in the assembly of the gods" that is, of those who are saved, standing in their midst and apportioning there the ranks of blessedness without any spatial distance separating him from the worthy.'[84]

It is the inherently trinitarian character of revelation,[85] and especially the revelation of the Son in the flesh, that shapes Maximus' understanding of the need to advance through the flesh of the incarnate Word to lay hold of the naked Word himself. For the whole Spirit and the whole Father are substantially united with the Word. The incarnation is a trinitarian event.[86] Repeatedly in the *Chapters on Theology* and elsewhere we come across the phrase 'the Word/the Son *of the Father*'.[87] The bodily manifestation of the Word-Son has as its ultimate object the revelation of the Father, who is 'by nature completely inseparable from the whole of his Word.'[88] In apprehending the Word, a person receives, or better, is received by the complete holy Trinity. It is not finally the vision of the glory of the Son to which the worthy attain, but the vision of the glory of the Father—in the Son—through the Spirit.[89]

This never detracts from Maximus' strongly christocentric and essentially incarnational vision. In fact, it strengthens it, for there can be no

---

[83] *Th.Oec.* 2.24.

[84] *Th.Oec.* 2.25.

[85] *Th.Oec.* 2.71. On the fundamentally trinitarian shape of revelation, see further Lars Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos: The Vision of St Maximus the Confessor* (New York: Crestwood, 1985), 32; Felix Heinzer, 'L'Explication Trinitaire de L'Économie chez Maxime le Confesseur', in Heinzer and Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium*, 161-162.

[86] See also *Q.Thal.* 60 (PG 90.624B-D); *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 31.87-97). The Father approves (εὐδοκῶν) the incarnation; the Son personally effects it (αὐτουργῶν); the Spirit co-operates in it (συνεργῶν). Compare Greg. Naz. *Or* 28.1.

[87] See, for example, *Th.Oec.* 2.21; 2.25; 2.71.

[88] *Th.Oec.* 2.71. Also *Th.Oec.* 2.22: 'Just as our human word which proceeds naturally from the mind is the messenger of the secret movements of the mind, so does the Word of God—who knows the Father by essence, as Word knows the Mind which has begotten it (since no created being can approach the Father without him)—reveal the Father whom he knows.'

[89] *Th.Oec.* 2.73.

vision of the Father except in the incarnate Son. But there are different levels of apprehension of the divine Word that appear to be conditioned by the corresponding level of knowledge of the inner meaning and salvific purpose of the incarnation. That is why, argues Maximus, the divine apostle Paul knew only 'in part', whereas the great evangelist John saw the glory of the only-begotten Son of the Father.[90] Paul's partial knowledge is the knowledge of the Word through his activities; John, it seems, pierces through the visible flesh of the Word and beholds the hidden yet revealed λόγος and σκοπός of the incarnation, that is, its specifically and inherently salvific (δι' ἡμᾶς) dimension, viewed from an eschatological perspective. This dimension has as its ultimate author and source not the Son, but the Father. It is the Father's glory which the only-begotten has made known. It is God's μεγαλὴ βουλή of which his Word is ὁ ἄγγελος.[91] In the overall fulfilment of that plan through the incarnation lies the accomplishment of our deifying adoption as sons of God.[92]

A parallel series of passages in which Maximus comments on the biblical phrases 'from strength to strength' and 'from glory to glory' occurs towards the end of the treatise. It is most significant that this treatment takes place within a trinitarian framework, and concludes with an explicit vision of what Maximus calls the μυστικὴ δοξολογία,[93] the eschatological culmination of the spiritual pilgrimage 'from strength to strength' and 'glory to glory'. The passage (μετάβασις), progress (προκοπή), and ascent (ἀνάβασις) to this blessed state of proximity to God the Father through the flesh of his Word is marked by ever increasing joy and thanksgiving. It is indeed paradoxical that in the face of such a *mysterium tremendum*, what is elsewhere imaged in terms of 'the formless, immaterial, and incorporeal state' of the darkness of the holy of holies,[94] is here presented in terms of the positive image of vocal, communal, jubilant doxology. To be sure, only when he has passed beyond the sensible and entered into the darkness of immediacy does Moses 'begin to adore God.'[95]

---

[90] *Th.Oec.* 2.76.

[91] *Th.Oec.* 2.22-23. The christological titles of Isaiah 9:6 are attributed to the ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς of Isaiah 9:5 (LXX). The μεγαλὴ βουλή of God is discussed at length in *Q.Thal.* 60 (*CCSG* 22, 73.5-75.48).

[92] *Th.Oec.* 2.21, 24-25.

[93] *Th.Oec.* 2.77-78.

[94] *Th.Oec.* 1.83-85.

[95] *Th.Oec.* 1.83-84. The passage bears apparent affinity with Gregory of Nyssa's commentary on Exodus 20:21: 'For leaving behind everything that is observed, not only

Despite the fact that the final *telos* of the worthy into the house of God is characterised by this state of adoration and rejoicing, there is nothing static about it. Indeed, Maximus is sensitive to the problems posed by the Origenist doctrine of 'satiety'. But his solution to the problem is subtle and profound. It is given in 2.88:

> Some seek to know what will be the state of those judged worthy of perfection in the kingdom of God, whether there will be progress and change or a settled state of sameness; and how one should think of bodies and souls. To this one might conjecture an answer by using the example of bodily life where there is a twofold reason for food: for both the growth and sustenance of those who are fed. For until we reach the perfection of bodily stature we are fed for growth; but when the body achieves the measure of its increase it is no longer fed for growth but for sustenance. In the same way there is a twofold reason for food for the soul. For while it is growing it is fed with virtues and contemplations until it no longer passes through all its stages and arrives at the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. At this point it leaves off making progress in increase and growth through various means and is fed directly (in a way which surpasses the mind and thus growth as well) a form of incorruptible food to sustain the Godlike perfection given to it and to manifest the infinite splendours of this food.

The passage from the need for growth to the need for sustenance parallels the passage from mediate to immediate knowledge of God.[96] In the words that follow, Maximus draws out the implications of the soul's immediate consumption of incorruptible food. Here we find present the main features of what we discovered at the beginning of this essay in the *locus classicus* from *Ambiguum* 10. In particular, there is the same reciprocal correspondence between divine revelation and human deification, with the attendant corporeal implications:

> When [the soul] receives through this food eternal blessedness indwelling in it, it becomes a god through the participation of divine grace, itself having left off all activities of mind and sense, and through itself having laid to rest

---

what sense comprehends but also what the intelligence thinks it sees, it keeps on penetrating deeper until by the intelligence's yearning for understanding it gains access to the invisible and the incomprehensible, and there it sees God. *This is the true knowledge of what is sought; this is the seeing that consists in not seeing, because that which is sought transcends all knowledge, being separated on all sides by incomprehensibility as by a kind of darkness.*' (*De vita Moysis* 2.163, emphasis added; trans. from Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of Moses*, Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1978.)

[96] The Lord's Prayer teaches that the soul's true and heavenly food is the Bread of Life, the Word of God. *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 59.560-63.631). See also *Th.Oec.* 2.56.

> the natural activities of the body, which has been joined together with the soul in its own [ie., the body's] corresponding participation of deification. The result is that God alone is made manifest (φαίνεσθαι) through the soul *and the body*, their natural characteristics being overwhelmed by the transcendence of glory.[97]

Once again we find a paradox at work. Just as there can only be adoration and praise in the formless state of darkness and unknowing, so the body can only become a medium for divine manifestation when it has been transformed and transcended in the passage from sensible to intelligible means of apprehension. The φυσικὰ γνωρίσματα refer not to those marks that are proper to human nature by virtue of creation, but to the characteristic features of empirical life bordered by mortality and penetrated by corruption: sexual reproduction, passionate attachment, corruption, and death.[98] The body is not left out of participation with God and the deification of the soul. Rather, it is caught up and transfigured by the superabundant glory of the God in whom it participates in tandem with the soul.[99]

In the union of these distinct but integral elements—body and soul, sensible and intelligible—we have come full circle. For the same paradox is at work here that we have discerned in the mysterious unity, yet distinction between *apophasis* and *kataphasis*, between *theologia* and *economia*, between *theoria* and *praxis*, between spirit and letter, between Word and words. It is no surprise, then, that scholars have recognised in Maximus' theological system, to use Blowers' words, an 'instinct' toward unity in diversity. On that note, let me then defer to his more sublime description of a theme that has become apparent in this study in the *Chapters in Theology* in particular, and in Maximus' theology in general:

> [Maximus'] exegesis only manifests further his underlying vision of the healthy and thoroughly profitable diversity of material symbols in scripture and creation. The value of those symbols lies not in their sheer reducibility to one unifying spiritual logos in a timeless moment of contemplation. Maximus envisions the Logos-Christ, himself the final revealer of the comprehensive logos of all things, working precisely through the diversity of symbolic meanings in scripture and creation that are ever illuminating the practical, contemplative,

---

[97] *Th.Oec.* 2.88: '. . . νικηθέντων αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῆς δόξης, τῶν φυσικῶν γνωρισμάτων.'

[98] *Myst.* 24; *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 50.401; 66.697).

[99] Maximus develops this further in a specifically christological context in *Amb.Io.* 42 (PG 91.1336A).

and mystagogical aspects of the monk's spiritual *diabasis*. Set in the context of Maximus' ongoing criticism of radical intellectualism in the Byzantine monastic tradition, authentic revelation is a process not of extreme spiritualization but of a *transfiguration* in which material realities disclose their created fullness κατὰ Χριστόν.[100]

University of Durham
Abbey House, Palace Green, *Durham* DH1 3RS, England

[100] Blowers, *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 254-255.

UN COMPLÉMENT DE L'ASCETICON COPTE DE L'ABBÉ ISAÏE

PAR

YOUHANNA NESSIM YOUSSEF

L'Abbé Isaïe est un moine égyptien; on lui attribue plusieurs œuvres spirituels.[1] La collection alphabétique des Apophtegmata Patrum Grecs ne citent que onze pièces tandis que la collection systematique inclue en tout 47 pièces attribuées à Isaïe de Scété.[2] M. Antoine Guillaumont a également édité ses paroles d'après les fragments des deux manuscrits Coptes[3] Sahidiques du Xe et du XIe siècles.[4] C'est avec raison que le Père Joseph-Marie Sauget, en éditant les fragments de l'Asceticon de l'Abbé Isaïe de Scété du Vatican arabe 71, a déclaré:

> Si en copte on n'a retrouvé jusqu'à présent que des fragments sahidiques provenant pour la plupart de deux manuscrits du Xe et XIe siècles et originaires du Deir-el-Abiad, il y a tout lieu de penser qu'également en cette langue circula une collection complète des œuvres de ce moine palestino-Egyptien.[5]

Afin de compléter le dossier de ce moine nous donnons ici bas un texte attribué à Isaïe l'anachorète, qui nous a été transmis par la chaîne Bohairique sur les Evangiles.[6] Ce texte explique le verset de Matthieu 5:25.

---

[1] Cf. L. Regnault, "Isaïe de Scété ou de Gaza," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 7, 1971, col. 2083-2095. R. Aubert, "Isaïe de Scété" *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclesiastique* Fasc. 150, Paris 1995, col. 120-124. Pour sa bibliographie cf. *CPG* 5555, 5556.

[2] Cf. J. C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition Grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum*, (= *Subsidia Hagiographica* 36) ^{2}éd., Bruxelles 1984, p. 183-184.

[3] Pour une description détaillée des deux manuscrits cf. A. Guillaumont, "La recension Copte de l'Asceticon de l'Abbé Isaïe" *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, The Byzantine Institute, Boston 1950, p. 49-60.

[4] A. Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon Copte de l'Abbé Isaïe, Bibliothèque d'Etudes Coptes* V, Le Caire 1956, p. ix.

[5] J.-M. Sauget, "Les fragments de l'Asceticon de l'abbé Isaïe de Scété du Vatican arabe 71" *Oriens Christianus* 48, 1964, p. 235-259 et en particulier p. 235.

[6] Pour une comparaison avec les chaînes Grecques cf. R. Devreesse, "Les chaînes exégétiques Grecques" *Dictionnaire de la Bible—Supplément*, éd. L. Pirot, Paris 1928, col. 1084-1233, et en particulier col. 1171, 1189, 1224 où Isaïe est mentionné.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Le manuscrit, daté de l'an 888 A.D., vient de la bibliothèque du Monastère el-Souriani de Wadi n'Natrûn mais qui était précédemment la propriété du Monastère de Saint Macaire.[7] Il est actuellement au *British Library Or. 8812*[8]

ⲏⲥⲁⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁⲭⲱⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲱⲱⲡⲓ ⲍⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲛϫⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲉⲛⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲍⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ ϩⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕϫⲏ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲕϩⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲉⲥⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲣⲱⲕϩ ⲛϭⲣϩⲓ ⲛϭⲏⲧⲕ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓϩⲁⲡ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲙⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲙⲡⲓϩⲩⲡⲉⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲱⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯϭⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧϭⲁⲏ ⲙⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲧⲉ.

Isaïe l'anachorète, "L'accusateur *donc* de l'homme est sa *conscience*. Soit, *donc*, comprehesif vite avec ceux que ta *conscience* te dira, tant que tu es avec elle dans ce *monde afin que* tu ne la foules par l'*insensibilité* et qu'elle brule en toi. *Et puis après*, au jour du jugement, elle te livrera au main du vrai (juste) *juge*, et le juge te donnera au *serviteur*, Amen je te le dis; tu ne sortiras pas de là que tu n'aies rendu jusqu'au dernier sou[9] qui est la fin de l'Eternité."[10]

Notre texte est plus développé que le texte correspond en Grec ou en Syriaque du Logos 11/99.[11]

Il est curieux que notre texte utilise pour "conscience" ⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ, à deux reprises, or le professeur Draguet s'était prononcé pour une origine Copte du texte avec le terme ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ.[12] La traduction arabe de la chaîne sur l'évangile de Matthieu utilise le mot مزخسر = "Sens", ce qui ne peut pas représenter le terme suggéré par le professeur Draguet.[13]

Le vocabulaire Copto-Grec qui se trouve également dans la recension grecque est pour la plupart présent dans le texte biblique, à savoir: ⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲉⲥⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ. D'autre part,

---

[7] Pour la bibliothèque de Saint Macaire cf H. Evelyn White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi'n Natrun* Part I, New York 1926, p. xxiii-xlii, L. Störk, *Koptische Handschriften* 2, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XX/2, Stuttgart 1995, p. 52-98.

[8] B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the year 1906*, The British Library, London 1987, N°249, p. 389-394.

[9] Matthieu 5:26.

[10] P. de Lagarde, *Catenae in Evangelia Aegyptiaca quae supersunt*, Gottingae 1886, ²édition Osnabrück 1971, p. 10:9-16.

[11] R. Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon Syriaque d'Abba Isaïe, CSCO* 293, *Syri* 122, Louvain 1968, p. 195-196.

[12] Draguet, op.cit., p. 46*-47*.

[13] cf. F. J. Caubet Iturbe, *La Cadena Arabe del Evangelio de San Mateo* (= *Studi e Testi* 254) Città del Vaticano 1969, p. 50-51. Id., *La Cadena Arabe del Evangelio de San Mateo* (= *Studi e Testi* 255) Città del Vaticano 1970, p. 58 note 2,3.

nous rencontrons d'autres termes qui n'ont pas de parallèle à savoir: ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ.

Le professeur R. Draguet avait donc raison en ce qui concerne le texte biblique car notre texte est très proche du Nouveau Testament Copte, mais dans ce cas précis la version Bohairique[14] est plus proche du texte d'Isaïe que la version Sahidique,[15] comme le montre le tableau suivant:

Isaïe de Scété[16]	Matthieu Bohairique	Matthieu Sahidique
ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲩⲛⲏⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲯⲱⲡⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲛⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲉⲛⲏⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲥⲩⲛⲏⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲍⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲯⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲫⲱⲥ ⲉϥⲭⲏ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲕ ⲫⲓ ⲡⲓⲙⲱⲓⲧ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ	ⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲉⲕⲟⲩⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲉⲡⲏ ⲉⲛⲫⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕⲯⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲫⲓ ⲧⲉϥⲣⲏ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ
ⲫⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕⲭⲏ ⲋⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲕⲫⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲥ ⲫⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁ-ⲛⲉⲥ ⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲣ-ⲱⲕⲫ ⲛⲋⲣⲏⲓ ⲛⲋⲏⲧⲕ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ ⲋⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲉⲫ-ⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲫⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲥ-ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲙⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓ-ⲧⲏⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲙⲡⲓⲫⲩⲡⲉⲣⲉ-ⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯⲋⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲩⲡⲏⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲥⲉⲫⲓⲧⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲯⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯⲋⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ	ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲧⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲣⲉϥ-ϯⲫⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲣⲉϥϯⲫⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲫⲩⲡⲏ-ⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲥⲉⲛⲟⲍⲕ ⲉⲡⲉ-ⲯⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲫⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲫⲙ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲛⲧⲕϯ ⲙⲡⲫⲁⲉ ⲛⲕⲟⲁ-ⲣⲁⲛⲧⲩⲥ

[14] G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Vol. I, Oxford 1898 ²édition, Osnabrück 1969, p. 30.

[15] G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, Vol. I, Oxford 1911 ²édition, Osnabrück 1969, p. 36.

[16] Les mots soulignés sont communs dans les autres versions.

De ce que nous avons exposé, nous pouvons conclure que le texte inserré dans la chaîne exégetique Copte peut bien être attribué à Isaïe de Scété. Il est vraisemblable qu'une collection Copte Bohaïrique de l'Asceticon d'Isaïe existait en plus de ce qui est connue de la version Sahidique.[17]

Cette note confirme en partie les thèses des regrettés professeurs J.-M. Sauget et R. Draguet.

P.O. Box 91
East Doncaster
VIC 3109
AUSTRALIA

[17] Ce qui est logiquement plausible puisque Isaïe est par définition un habitant de la Basse-Egypte (Scété).

DIE KIRCHENVÄTER IN OECUMENIUS' *SCHOLIA IN IOHANNEM CHRYSOSTOMUM*

VON

MARC DE GROOTE

Seit der Edition seiner *Scholia in Iohannem Chrysostomum* (CPG 7472)[1] und der kürzlich erschienenen Ausgabe seines *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (CPG 7470)[2] sind hinfort die beiden authentischen Werke des Oecumenius (6. Jh.) dem Leser vollständig zugänglich. Die Lektüre beider Schriften weist eine frappante Kenntnis des Autors von der Literatur der Kirchenväter auf: Manchmal zitiert er aus ihrem Œuvre oder spielt darauf an.[3] Der Wichtigkeit solcher Zitate und Anspielungen halber, die seit K. Staab außer allem Zweifel steht,[4] liste ich in der untenstehenden Tabelle alphabetisch geordnet alle Kirchenväter auf, die von Oecumenius in seinen Scholien zu Johannes Chrysostomus benutzt wurden.

---

[1] K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*, Münster 1933, S. XXXVII-XL und 423-469. In diesem Werk wurde (S. XXXVII-XXXVIII) überzeugend nachgewiesen, dass Oecumenius, der seit Donatus' Edition einer Katene zu den paulinischen Briefen (CPG C 165) aus dem Jahre 1532 jahrhundertelang zu den größten Paulus-Exegeten gezählt wurde, in Wirklichkeit nur der Autor einiger erklärenden Noten gewesen ist, die nicht zu den paulinischen Briefen an sich gehören, sondern von ihm als Glossen einem Paulus-Kommentar, den er gerade kopierte, hinzugefügt wurden, nämlich den Homilien des Johannes Chrysostomus über die paulinischen Briefen (CPG 4427-4440).

[2] M. De Groote, *Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, Traditio Exegetica Graeca 8, Lovanii 1999.

[3] Cf. K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. XXXIX; M. De Groote, *o.c.*, S. 326-336; id., Die Quaestio Oecumeniana, *SEJG* 36 (1996), S. 104.

[4] K. Staab, *l.c.*: Solche Zitate sind uns wertvoller als seine eigene Paulusexegese.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

1. Athanasius Alex.

In I Cor. 6,15-18

Καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου ἔστι πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἑρμηνεία ἐν τῷ Περὶ σεμνοῦ γάμου (435,9-10: "Neben all diesem gibt es auch von dem heiligen Athanasius eine Erklärung in seinem Werk *De venerandis nuptiis*")
Vielleicht Hinweis auf eine Homilie, die uns nicht mehr erhalten ist.[5]

2. Basilius Caesar.

In II Thess. 3,5

Ὁ μακάριος Βασίλειος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀμφιλόχιον τοῦτο σημειοῦται, ὅτι τῷ πνεύματι εὔχεται ὁ Παῦλος (458,10-11: "Der selige Basilius notiert dies in seiner Schrift *Ad Amphilochium*, weil Paulus zu dem Geist betet")
= *De spiritu sancto* (CPG 2839) XXI (§ 52): Εὕρομεν τοίνυν παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ· "Ὁ δὲ Κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν θλίψεων." Τίς ὁ κατευθύνων Κύριος εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπην καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπομονήν; Ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταδουλούμενοι. Εἴτε γὰρ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὁ λόγος, πάντως ἂν εἴρητο· Ὁ δὲ Κύριος ὑμᾶς κατευθύναι εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην· εἴτε περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, προσέκειτο ἂν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπομονήν. Ζητείτωσαν οὖν τί ἐστιν ἄλλο πρόσωπον, ὃ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου τιμᾶσθαι ἄξιον.[6]

In I Tim. 5,24-25

Ὁ δέ γε μακάριος Βασίλειος οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν, ὡς οὐδὲν τοῦ κεφαλαίου πρὸς χειροτονίαν συντείνοντος (459,21-22: "Der selige Basilius hat es so ausgelegt, dass nichts in diesem Kapitel in die Richtung einer Auserwählung weist")
Locus non repertus.

---

[5] So id., *o.c.*, S. 435 app. crit. 9/10.

[6] Ed. B. Pruche, *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit.* Introduction, texte, traduction et notes. Deuxième édition entièrement refondue, SChr 17bis, Paris 1968, S. 432,10-20: "Wir fanden also bei dem Apostel: 'Der Herr richte euer Herz zur Liebe Gottes und zur Beharrlichkeit Christi in den Prüfungen'. Wer ist dieser Herr, der zur Liebe Gottes und zur Beharrlichkeit Christi in den Prüfungen richtet? Dass diejenigen uns Antwort geben, die den Geist versklaven! Wenn der Satz von Gott dem Vater handelte, hätte er unbedingt gesagt: 'Der Herr richte euch zu *seiner* Liebe'; wenn er aber den Sohn gemeint hätte, wäre daran 'zu *seiner* Beharrlichkeit' hinzugefügt worden. Dass sie also suchen, wer diese andere Person ist, die es würdig ist, mit dem Namen 'Herr' geehrt zu werden."

3. Clemens Alex.

In II Tim. 2,2

οὕτως ὁ Κλήμης ἐν ἑβδόμῳ Ὑποτυπώσεων (460,24-26: "So Clemens im 7. Buch der *Hypotyposes*")
= *Hypotyposes* VII (CPG 1380): "Διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων" τουτέστι νόμου καὶ προφητῶν. τούτους γὰρ <ὁ> ἀπόστολος ἐποιεῖτο μάρτυρας τοῦ ἰδίου κηρύγματος. Οὕτως ὁ Κλήμης ἐν ἑβδόμῳ Ὑποτυπώσεων.[7]

4. Cyrillus Alex.

In Rom. 9,29

Δύνῃ δὲ καὶ περὶ Χριστοῦ νοῆσαι τοῦτο· οὕτως ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλος (429,24-25: "Man kann dies auch auf Christus beziehen; so der heilige Cyrillus")
a) = *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam* (CPG 5203) I,1: Οὐ γὰρ ἀπόλωλεν ὁλοτρόπως (sc. ὁ Ἰσραήλ) (. . .). Ἦσαν γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ θεσπέσιοι μαθηταί, καὶ μὴν καὶ ὅσοι πεπιστεύκασιν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν.[8]
b) = *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. ad Romanos* (CPG 5209 (1)). Nicht mehr erhalten.[9]

In Eph. 2,2

Ὥστε κατὰ τὸ νόημα τοῦτο, ὃ μᾶλλον καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Κύριλλος (. . .) δέχεται, . . . (448,15-16: "Folglich dieser Ansicht entsprechend, die vielmehr auch der heilige Cyrillus annimmt, . . .")
= *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. in Ephesios.*
Nicht mehr erhalten.[10]

---

[7] Ed. O. Stählin – L. Früchtel – U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus* III. *Stromata Buch VII und VIII. Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae propheticae, Quis diues saluetur, Fragmente*, GCS 17², Berlin 1970, S. 201,13-15 (= Fragment 21), übernommen aus der Edition des F. Morellus, II., Paris 1631, S. 263: "'Vor vielen Zeugen', d.h. Gesetz und Propheten; diese betrachtete der Apostel nämlich als Zeugen seiner eigenen Verkündigung. So Clemens im 7. Buch der *Hypotyposes*." Cf. Theophylactus von Bulgarien, *Expositio in Epistulam II ad Timotheum* II,2: Τινὲς δέ, *πολλοὺς μάρτυρας*, νόμον καὶ προφήτας ἐνόησαν. Γραφικαῖς γὰρ μαρτυρίαις συνεκροτεῖτό μοι ὁ λόγος (ed. PG 125,101B11-13).—Cf. Anm. 13.

[8] Ed. PG 70,29A7-11: "Denn Israel ist nicht ganz zugrunde gegangen. (. . .) Daraus sind doch auch die heiligen Jünger hervorgegangen und auch all diejenigen, die an unseren Herrn Jesus Christus geglaubt haben." Betrifft eine Erklärung von *Is.* 1,9. Für die Exegese von *Rom.* 9,29, siehe Anm. 9.

[9] Cf. K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. 429 app. crit. 25.

[10] Cf. id., *o.c.*, S. 448 app. crit. 15/16.

In Hebr. 12,27

a) Πρόσχες καὶ τῇ παραγραφῇ τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου εἰς τὸν Ἀγγαῖον (469,2-3: "Man achte auch auf die Anmerkung des seligen Cyrillus mit Bezug auf Aggaeus")
= *Commentarius in XII prophetas minores* (CPG 5204), 13 betreffs *Agg.* 2,6: τοιοῦτόν τινα σεισμὸν πάλιν ἔσεσθαί φησι κατὰ τὸν τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιδημίας καιρόν, ὡς οὐδενὸς ἀγνοήσειν μέλλοντος τὰ δι' αὐτῆς κατορθώματα. ἔγνω μὲν γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ τούτου μάρτυς ὁ Παῦλος λέγων "..." [*Eph.* 3,10].[11]
b) οὕτως ὁ Κύριλλος (468,21: "So Cyrillus")
= *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. ad Hebraeos* (CPG 5209 (3)): Ἔγνω μὲν γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τὸ μυστήριον, ἔγνω δὲ ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ σύμπασα γῆ· δύο γὰρ γεγόνασι μεταθέσεις βίων ἐπιφανεῖς ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος, καὶ διαθῆκαι δύο καλοῦνται, καὶ σεισμοὶ γῆς, διὰ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος περιβόητον· ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· καὶ τρίτον σεισμὸν εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε μετάστασιν, τὰ μηκέτι κινούμενα μηδὲ σαλευόμενα.[12]

5. Eusebius Caesar.

In Gal. 2,11-16

Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ ἀποδείκνυσι μὴ εἶναι τὸν Κηφᾶν τοῦτον τὸν Πέτρον, ἀλλ' ὁμώνυμον αὐτῷ ἕνα τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα (446,9-11: "Eusebius, Schüler des Pamphilus, zeigt in seiner *Historia ecclesiastica*, dass dieser Cephas nicht Petrus ist, sondern ein Gleichnamiger, einer der siebzig")
= *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495) I,12,2: (...) καὶ Κηφᾶν, περὶ οὗ φησιν ὁ

---

[11] Ed. P.E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* II. Oxonii 1868, Bruxelles 1965², S. 265,7-11: "Er sagt, dass es um die Zeit des Erscheinens des Heilands wieder solch ein Beben geben wird, weil keiner nicht das Gute kennen wird, das dadurch kommen wird. Der Himmel kannte doch das Mysterium, und davon ist Paulus ein Zeuge, wenn er sagt: ..."

[12] Ed. id., *Sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis evangelium* III. Oxonii 1872, Bruxelles 1965², S. 415,12-19: "Der Himmel sowie die ganze Erde kannten doch das Mysterium. Im Laufe der Zeit haben nämlich zwei außergewöhnliche Änderungen im Leben stattgefunden—sie werden 'die zwei Testamente' genannt und 'Erdbeben' wegen der Bekanntheit eines solchen Ereignisses—: die erste Änderung von den Götzenbildern zum Gesetz, die zweite vom Gesetz zum Evangelium. Jetzt wird uns ein drittes Beben angekündigt, nämlich der Umzug aus dem Leben hier zu dem, was jenseits ist, und nicht mehr in Aufruhr gebracht oder erschüttert werden wird."

Παῦλος "ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην", (*Gal.* 2,11) ἕνα φησὶ (sc. Clemens Alex., *Hypotyposes* V) γεγονέναι τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν, ὁμώνυμον Πέτρῳ τυγχάνοντα τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.[13]

6. Gregorius Naz.

In I Cor. 2,16

νοῦν γὰρ τὸν πατέρα λέγειν ἔθος τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὡς Γρηγόριος (432,25-433,1: "Die Heiligen pflegen den Vater Noûς zu nennen, wie Gregorius"); es folgen zwei Zitate (433,1-2 und 2-4).
= (1) *Orationes* (CPG 3010) XII,1: ἀλλὰ καὶ κλείω καὶ ἀνοίγω τὴν ἐμὴν θύραν Νῷ καὶ Λόγῳ καὶ Πνεύματι, τῇ μιᾷ συμφυίᾳ τε καὶ θεότητι.[14]
= (2) *Orationes* XXXVIII,9 = XLV,5: πρῶτον μὲν ἐννοεῖ (sc. ἡ ἀγαθότης) τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ οὐρανίους· καὶ τὸ ἐννόημα ἔργον ἦν, Λόγῳ συμπληρούμενον καὶ Πνεύματι τελειούμενον.[15]

In Eph. 1,17

Ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγόριος ἐν τῷ Περὶ υἱοῦ λόγῳ, ὡς νομίζω, τὰ δύο εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐδέξατο (448,5-6: "Meiner Meinung nach bezog der heilige Gregorius in seiner Rede *De Filio* beide (sc. *Θεός* und *πατήρ*) auf Christus")
= *Orationes* XXX (theologica IV),8: Χριστοῦ μὲν Θεός, τῆς δὲ δόξης Πατήρ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον ἕν, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ φύσει, τῇ δὲ συνόδῳ τούτων.[16]

---

[13] Ed. E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke* II. *Die Kirchengeschichte.*—Th. Mommsen, *Die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus.* Erster Teil. *Die Bücher I bis V*, GCS 9,1, Leipzig 1903, S. 82,2-5: "... und er behauptet, dass Cephas, über den Paulus sagt: 'Als Cephas aber nach Antiochien gekommen war, bin ich ihm offen entgegengetreten,' einer der siebzig Schüler gewesen ist, Namensbruder des Apostels Petrus." Cf. O. Stählin – L. Früchtel – U. Treu, *o.c.*, S. 196,10-13 (= Fragment 4).

[14] Ed. M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 6-12.* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, SChr 405, Paris 1995, S. 350,1-3: "Aber ich schließe und öffne meine Tür für den Noûς, das Wort und den Geist, für die einzige Einheit und Göttlichkeit."

[15] *Or.* XXXVIII,9 ed. C. Moreschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41.* Introduction, texte critique et notes. Traduction par P. Gallay, SChr 358, Paris 1990, S. 120,6-8; *Or.* XLV,5 ed. PG 36,629A7-10: "Zuerst denkt sie (sc. ἡ ἀγαθότης) an die Mächte der Engel und die himmlischen Mächte, und dieses Denken war ein Werk, das von dem Wort vollbracht und von dem Geist vollendet wird."

[16] Ed. P. Gallay, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques).* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Avec la collaboration de M. Jourjon, SChr 250, Paris 1978, S. 242,6-7: "Er ist der Gott Christi und der Vater der Herrlichkeit. Beide sind zwar eins, aber nicht von Natur aus, sondern durch ihre Union."

In Hebr. 10,1

a) εἴρηται τῷ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγορίῳ ἐν τῷ Ἀπολογητικῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τοὺς πολιτευομένους, τὰ νῦν θεῖα μυστήρια ἀντίτυπα εἶναι μειζόνων μυστηρίων (466,16-18: "Der heilige Gregorius hat in seiner *Apologetica* und in der Rede *Ad cives* (sc. *Nazianzenos*) gesagt, dass die göttlichen Mysterien, von denen jetzt die Rede ist, Kopien größerer Mysterien sind")
= (1) *Orationes* (CPG 3010) II,95: πῶς ἔμελλον θαρρῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν (sc. θυσίαν), τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον;[17]
= (2) *Orationes* XVII,4: Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι δόγμα Θεοῦ παλαιόν τε καὶ πάγιον, σκότος εἶναι ἀποκρυφὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὀφθαλμῶν κεχυμένον· καὶ τὰ πολλὰ μὴ καθορᾶσθαι τῆς αὐτοῦ διοικήσεως, πλὴν ὅσον ἐν ἀμυδροῖς αἰνίγμασι καὶ φαντάσμασιν· εἴτε τὸν τῦφον ἡμῶν συστέλλοντος, ἵν' εἰδῶμεν τὸ μηδὲν ὄντες πρὸς τὴν ἀληθινὴν σοφίαν καὶ πρώτην, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν νεύωμεν μόνον, καὶ ζητῶμεν ἀεὶ ταῖς ἐκεῖθεν αὐγαῖς ἐναστράπτεσθαι· εἴτε διὰ τῆς ἀνωμαλίας τῶν ὁρωμένων καὶ περιτρεπομένων μετάγοντος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰ ἑστῶτα καὶ μένοντα.[18]
b) καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀναστάσεως (466,18: "Und wiederum in seiner Rede *De resurrectione*"); es folgt ein Zitat (466,19-20).
= *Orationes* XLV,23: Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ Πάσχα, νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον (τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν Πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος) μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον, τελεώτερον καὶ καθαρώτερον.[19]

In Hebr. 12,2

. . . ὡς καὶ Γρηγόριός φησιν (467,20: "wie auch Gregorius sagt"); es folgt ein Zitat (467,20-468,3).
= *Orationes* XII,4: Ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς οὕτως, ᾧ μένειν ἐξὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας τιμῆς καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν μέχρι τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς [cf. *Phil.*

---

[17] Ed. J. Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 1-3*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, SChr 247, Paris 1978, S. 212,21-214,1: "Wie würde ich es wagen, ihm das externe Opfer anzubieten, die Kopie der großen Mysterien?"

[18] Ed. PG 35,969C3-13: "Und dies ist ein altes und festgegründetes Dekret Gottes, dass er sich in der vor unseren Augen ausgegossenen Finsternis versteckt, und dass das meiste seiner Herrschaft nicht durchschaut werden kann, außer in obskuren Rätseln und Visionen. Entweder will er unsere Eitelkeit zügeln, damit wir wissen, dass wir gegenüber der wahren und ersten Weisheit nichts bedeuten, und darum nur zu ihm neigen und stets suchen, von den dorther flutenden Strahlen erleuchtet zu werden, oder uns durch die Unbeständigkeit desjenigen, was erkennbar und dem Wandel unterworfen ist, zu demjenigen führen, was fest und bleibend ist."

[19] Ed. PG 36,653C10-656A4: "Wir werden des Osterfestes teilhaftig sein, jetzt noch symbolisch, obwohl offener als im alten Gesetz (das gesetzliche Osterfest war—ich scheue es nicht, das zu sagen—eine obskure Ansicht schlechthin), aber ein wenig später vollständiger und purer."

2,6-7], ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἵν' ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάθεσιν ἀναλώσῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ ἀποκτείνῃ τῷ θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον.[20]

7. Gregorius Nyss.

In Rom. 5,13-14a

. . . ὧν καὶ Γρηγόριος ὑπάρχει ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ποιήματι (424,25-26: ". . . zu denen auch Gregorius mit seinem Werk *De opificio hominis* gehört")
= *De opificio hominis* (CPG 3154) XXI: νυνὶ δὲ σύμμικτός πως ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ κακοῦ φύσις, ἐν μὲν τῷ βάθει τὸν ὄλεθρον οἷόν τινα δόλον ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἔχουσα, ἐν δὲ τῇ κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἀπάτῃ καλοῦ τινα φαντασίαν παραδεικνύουσα. καλὸν δοκεῖ τοῖς φιλαργύροις ἡ τῆς ὕλης εὐχροια· ἀλλὰ ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἡ φιλαργυρία γίνεται. τίς δ' ἂν ἐπὶ τὸν δυσώδη βόρβορον τῆς ἀκολασίας κατώλισθεν, εἰ μὴ τὴν ἡδονὴν καλόν τε καὶ αἱρετὸν ᾤετο ὁ τῷ δελέατι τούτῳ πρὸς τὸ πάθος κατασυρόμενος; οὕτω καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐγκεκρυμμένην ἔχοντα τὴν διαφθοράν, αἱρετὰ παρὰ τὴν πρώτην δοκεῖ, διά τινος ἀπάτης τοῖς ἀνεπισκέπτοις ἀντ' ἀγαθοῦ σπουδαζόμενα.[21]

In Eph. 3,10

Οὕτως ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγόριος ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ὁμιλίᾳ τῆς ἑρμηνείας τῶν Ἀσμάτων διασαφηνίζων λέγει (449,14-16: "So erklärt der heilige Gregorius in der 8. seiner *In Canticum canticorum homiliae*")
= *In Canticum canticorum homiliae* (CPG 3158) VIII.[22]

---

[20] Ed. M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti, *o.c.*, S. 356,9-14: "Denn es ist so, dass Christus, obgleich es ihm möglich war, in seiner eigenen Würdigkeit und Göttlichkeit zu bleiben, sich nicht nur entäußerte und wie ein Sklave wurde, sondern auch unter Missbilligung der Schande das Kreuz ertrug, damit er in seinen eigenen Peinen die Sünden vernichtete und den Tod durch seinen Tod sterben ließ."

[21] Ed. G.H. Forbes, *Sancti Patris nostri Gregorii Nysseni, Basilii M. fratris, quae supersunt omnia* I., Burntisland 1855, S. 226,19-30: "Jetzt aber ist die Natur des Bösen irgendwie divers: Grundsätzlich trägt sie in sich den Untergang wie eine versteckte List, indes sie dem äußeren Schein nach betrügerisch das Gute sehen lässt. Für denjenigen, der auf Geld erpicht ist, scheint die schöne Farbe des Materials etwas Hervorragendes; Habgier ist dennoch die Wurzel allen Übels. Wer versänke im stinkenden Schlamm der Zügellosigkeit, wenn er nicht, durch ein solches Lockmittel in diese Krankheit gezogen, meinte, der Genuss wäre eine gute, wünschenswerte Sache? So auch scheinen die übrigen Sünden, die in sich verschollen den Untergang tragen, zuerst wünschenswert, und streben die Unachtsamen irregeleitet statt nach dem Guten ihnen nach."

[22] Cf. H. Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni in Canticum canticorum*, in: Gregorii Nysseni opera auxilio aliorum virorum doctorum edenda curavit W. Jaeger VI., Leiden 1960, S. 254,13-256,5.

8. Johannes Chrysostomus

In I Cor. 6,15-18

. . . ταύτην τε αὐτὴν εἰπὼν τῇ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου (434,14-15: ". . . und sagt, dass es sich um dieselbe Interpretation handelt wie die des heiligen Johannes") = *In epistulam I ad Corinthios homiliae* (CPG 4429) XVIII,1.[23]

In I Cor. 7,25-28

Τὰ *περὶ παρθένων* ἐμμελέστερον ἡρμήνευσεν ὡς ἐν μονοβίβλῳ τὰ περὶ τούτου διαλαβών (436,16-17: "Die Darlegungen bezüglich der Jungfrauen erklärte er eingehender in einer besonderen Schrift über dieses Thema") = *De virginitate* (CPG 4313) (436,16-17).[24]

In Eph. 2,2

Ὥστε κατὰ τὸ νόημα τοῦτο, ὃ μᾶλλον (. . .) καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης δέχεται, . . . (448,15-16: "Folglich dieser Ansicht entsprechend, die vielmehr auch der heilige Johannes annimmt, . . .")
= *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* (CPG 4431) IV,1: Ὁρᾷς τὸ προσηνὲς τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ πῶς πανταχοῦ παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἀκροατήν, οὐ βαρῶν αὐτόν; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι εἰς ἔσχατον κακίας ἠλάσατε· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι νεκρωθῆναι· ὥστε μὴ σφόδρα βαρῦναι αὐτούς· αἰσχύνονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῶν προτέρων κακῶν εἰς μέσον φερομένων, κἂν ἀπολλύμενα ᾖ καὶ κίνδυνον οὐκ ἔχοντα· δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς συνεργόν, ὥστε μὴ νομισθῆναι τὸ πᾶν αὐτῶν εἶναι, καὶ συνεργὸν ἰσχυρόν. Τίνα δὴ τοῦτον; Τὸν διάβολον.[25]

---

[23] Ed. F. Field, *Sancti Patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum per homilias facta* II., Oxford 1847, S. 205,15-207,16.

[24] Ed. H. Musurillo, *Jean Chrysostome. La virginité.* Texte et introduction critiques. Introduction générale, traduction et notes par B. Grillet, SChr 125, Paris 1966, S. 92-394.

[25] Ed. F. Field, *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 136,23-30: "Siehst du die Sanftmütigkeit des Paulus und wie er überall den Zuhörer tröstet, ohne ihn zu belasten? Er hat gesagt: 'Ihr seid bis zur äußersten Bosheit gegangen' (das ist mit dem Sterben gemeint); damit er sie nicht schwer belastet—denn die Menschen schämen sich, wenn ihre früheren Schlechtigkeiten vorgebracht werden, selbst wenn sie vergeben sind und keine Gefahr darstellen—, gibt er ihnen einen Helfer, damit sie nicht meinen, dass alles ihnen angerechnet wird, und zwar einen starken. Wer ist denn dieser? Der Teufel."

In Eph. 4,16

. . . οὔτε γὰρ ἐχώρησα τὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰω<άννου> ἔξει νοῆσαι (450,5-6: "denn ich konnte die Ausführungen des seligen Johannes nicht genau verstehen") = *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* XI,3.[26]

In Eph. 6,17

τμητικὸν γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ. οὕτω μᾶλλον ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης (452,6-7: "Denn das Wort Gottes kann schneiden; so vielmehr der selige Johannes") = *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* XXIV,1: Ἤτοι τὸ πνεῦμά φησιν, ἤτοι ἐν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τῇ πνευματικῇ. Διὰ γὰρ ταύτης πάντα τέμνεται, διὰ ταύτης πάντα διακόπτεται, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος ἀποτέμνομεν διὰ ταύτης.[27]

In Col. (Epilogus)

. . . τὰς παραγραφὰς τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου τῆς πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ἐπιστολῆς (455,23-24: ". . . die Erklärungen des seligen Johannes zum Kolosserbrief") = *In epistulam ad Colossenses homiliae* (CPG 4433) I-XII.[28]

9. Severianus Gabalensis

In I Cor. 6,15-18

Εἶπεν εἰς τοῦτο πλείους ἑρμηνείας ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Σευηριανὸς τεύχει νζ΄ λόγῳ ς΄ κεφαλαίῳ ιθ΄ (434,13-14: "Der heilige Severianus hat hierzu in seinem 57. Buch, 6. Rede, 19. Kapitel mehrere Erklärungen gegeben") = *Fragmenta in epistulas S. Pauli* (CPG 4219) LVII,6,19 (434,13-14).[29]

Schließlich soll auch auf die Eigentümlichkeit hingewiesen werden, dass Oecumenius in diesen Scholien zweimal auf eigenes Werk verweist: Mit Bezug auf *Hebr.* 9,1-4 schreibt er: Τρεῖς ἐσημειωσάμην εἰς τὸ Ὀκτάτευχον σκηνὰς οὔσας· μίαν μέν, περὶ ἧς φησιν τὸ *ἅγιον κοσμικόν* [*Hebr.* 9,1], ἔνθα ἦν

---

[26] Ed. id., *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 220,11-221,3.

[27] Ed. id., *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 353,18-21: "Entweder sagt er 'der Geist' oder 'im geistlichen Schwert'. Denn durch dieses Schwert wird alles geschnitten, dadurch wird alles durchfurcht, dadurch schneiden wir dem Drachen den Kopf ab."

[28] Ed. id., *o.c.* V., Oxford 1855, S. 172-312.

[29] K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. 434,13-17 (*Oec.*): cf. S. 248,6-11 (*Sev. in I Cor.* 6,16-19) || S. 434,17-24 (*Oec.*): cf. S. 248,11-30 (*Sev. in I Cor.* 6,16-19).

τὸ χαλκοῦν θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων, καὶ παντὶ ἐξῆν τῷ λαῷ εἰσιέναι καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν· δευτέραν δὲ ἔνθα τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἐξῆν ἀεὶ τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελεῖν [cf. *Hebr.* 9,6], ἔνθα ἦν *ἡ λυχνία καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων* [*Hebr.* 9,2]. τρίτην ἔνθα ἦν τὸ θυμιατήριον καὶ ἡ κιβωτός [cf. *Hebr.* 9,4] ἐν ᾗ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰσῄει μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς [cf. *Hebr.* 9,7] (465,7-13: "Ich habe niedergeschrieben, dass es, was den Oktateuch betrifft, drei Zelte gibt: eines, über das er sagt: *ein irdisches Heiligtum*, in dem sich der bronzene Altar für die Brandopfer befand—das ganze Volk konnte hineintreten und die Opfer bringen—, ein zweites in dem die Priester die heiligen Dienste verrichten konnten—dort waren *der Leuchter, der Tisch und die Schaubrote*—, ein drittes in dem sich das Weinrauchfass und die Lade befanden, in das nur einmal im Jahr der Hohepriester allein hineinging"). In Bezug auf *Hebr.* 9,5 bittet er: ὅρα τὴν ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ παραγραφὴν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τούτων τόποις (465,16-17: "Siehe den Kommentar in *Exodus* an den einschlägigen Stellen"). Merkwürdig ist, dass er nirgendwo seinen Kommentar zur Apokalypse erwähnt; vielleicht kam dieses exegetische Werk erst später zustande.[30]

B-8200 Brugge-SintMichiels, Kortebrugge 3

[30] Cf. id., *o.c.*, S. XXXIX.

THE CHURCH OF "ST." ACACIUS AT CONSTANTINOPLE

BY

DAVID WOODS

The purpose of this note is to propose a new solution to the apparent contradiction between the so-called *Syriac Breviary* and later Greek and Latin sources concerning the location of the martyrdom of the soldier St. Acacius. The *Syriac Breviary*, which survives in a manuscript dated to 411 and is based on a Greek original which was probably written at Nicomedia about 362, seems to imply that St. Acacius was martyred at Nicomedia.[1] In contrast, the *Hieronymian Martyrology* which was probably written in northern Italy sometime during the period 431-51 sets his martyrdom at Constantinople.[2] It is generally accepted at present that St. Acacius was martyred at Constantinople, and that the *Syriac Breviary* errs in its apparent claim to the contrary. The best one can make of its notice in this matter is that it had been intended to record the special celebration of his feast in Nicomedia rather than his original martyrdom there.[3] The two main arguments in support of his martyrdom at Constantinople rather than Nicomedia are that the ecclesiastical history of Socrates proves the existence of a Church of St. Acacius at Constantinople from an early date and that, whatever its other problems, the surviving Greek passion (*BHG* 13) does indeed set his martyrdom and burial at Constantinople.[4] Yet closer inspection reveals that neither of these sources proves what it has been claimed to prove.

---

[1] See J. de Rossi and L. Duchesne (eds.), *Acta Sanctorum Novembris II.1* (Brussels, 1894), LII-LXV, at LVII. Their Greek translation runs: Ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ Ἀκάκιος μάρτυρ. It dates his feast to 10 May.

[2] See H. Delehaye (ed.), *Acta Sanctorum Novembris II.2: Commentarius Perpetuus in Martyrologium Hieronymianum ad Recensionem Henrici Quentin*, OSB (Brussels, 1931), p. 238. It dates his feast to 8 May and reads: "Constantinopoli Acaci militis et Maximi presbiteri".

[3] So H. Delehaye, *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs* (Brussels, 1933), p. 233, asks: "Avait-il une fête spéciale dans cette ville, ou y a-t-il erreur dans la rubrique?"

[4] See H. Delehaye, "Saints de Thrace et de Mésie", *Analecta Bollandiana* 31 (1912), 161-291, at 228-32. The passion may be found at *PG* 115, cols. 217-40.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

To begin with Socrates, he claims that bishop Macedonius of Constantinople (341-60) transferred the body of Constantine I to the church in which the body of St. Acacius then lay in 359 due to the unsafe condition of the Church of the Holy Apostles at this time.[5] It is important to note, however, that this does not prove the existence of a "Church of St. Acacius" as such at Constantinople by 359, although this is how this passage is normally interpreted.[6] At most, it only proves that Socrates believed that Macedonius had transferred the body to a church which he himself knew as the "Church of St. Acacius" at the time that he was writing c.439, which is a rather different matter.[7] It does not prove that the church had always been known by this exact title, i.e. St. Acacius, nor that it had always contained, or been alleged to contain, the body of St. Acacius. More importantly, there is nothing in the anecdote itself which requires that Macedonius must have believed that it was the "Church of St. Acacius" at the time of his action. He moved Constantine's body there, one suspects, simply because it was the nearest available church. The same argument also applies to Socrates' second anecdote concerning a chapel (οἰκίσκος) dedicated to St. Acacius.[8] According to this story, the emperor Arcadius (395-408) had once visited this chapel which was built near a walnut-tree upon which Acacius was supposed to have been hanged.[9] His presence drew crowds of onlookers from the building within whose courtyard this walnut-tree lay with the result that when this building suddenly collapsed,

---

[5] Soc. *HE* 2.38.40: μεταφέρει τὸ σῶμα τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐν ᾗ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος Ἀκακίου ἀπέκειτο.

[6] See, e.g., G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une Capitale: Constantinople et ses Institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1984). No source attributes the construction of a Church of St. Acacius to Constantine I before the so-called *Patria of Constantinople*, which are of late date and extremely unreliable. Eusebius of Caesarea claims only that Constantine adorned his city "with very many places of worship, very large martyr-shrines, and splendid houses" (*VC* 3.48.1). Hence modern authorities, e.g. A. Cameron and S. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), p. 297, usually admit only that he *may* have been responsible for the construction of the Church of St. Acacius.

[7] The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, drawn up under Theodosius II (408-50), proves the existence of an "ecclesiam sive martyrium Sancti Acacii" at this relatively late period anyway.

[8] Soc. *HE* 6.23.2-6. It is not entirely clear whether his two anecdotes refer to the same building.

[9] The passion of Acacius specifically records that he was beheaded with a sword (*PG* 115, col. 239, ch. 22), as one would normally expect. This contradiction is puzzling. If the story is not a totally fictitious local legend, then one wonders whether it may preserve a corrupt memory of the death of another Acacius at this spot, not the military martyr.

no-one was trapped inside and killed. Again, this anecdote does not itself constitute firm proof that the chapel was dedicated to St. Acacius at the time of the alleged incident rather than at the time that Socrates was writing. However, the discovery of two unpublished sermons which bishop John Chryostom (398-404) is supposed to have preached in a "Church of St. Acacius" probably offers sufficient independent testimony to corroborate Socrates' anecdote in this instance, that there was a cult of a St. Acacius at Constantinople by this date, so that we may also assume that there probably was a church of this exact title at Constantinople c.400.[10]

The realisation that Socrates' testimony does not prove that a "Church of St. Acacius" was known as such much before 400 is important in the present context because it is possible to explain the existence of a "Church of Acacius" other than by reference to the martyr of this name. In particular, one notes the possibility that it may have been named after its founder, i.e. that a certain Acacius may have been responsible for the construction of this church. This is an attractive proposition in this case because Eusebius of Caesarea reveals that Constantine I did place a great deal of trust in a certain count Acacius. It was this man, a Christian obviously, whom Constantine ordered to destroy the idols at Mambre in Palestine and to construct a new church there instead.[11] He also trusted him to report to him on the disturbances at Antioch concerning the election of a new

---

[10] I thank Dr. Wendy Mayer for drawing these sermons to my attention and providing transcripts also. The title of one, *In illud: Quia quod stultum est dei* (*CPG* 4441.14), reveals that it was preached ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ Ἀκακίον τὸν μάρτυρα while the title of the other, *In martyres omnes* (*CPG* 4441.15), reveals that it was preached ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀκακίου. I do not wish to be diverted into a discussion of whether there was more than one church or shrine dedicated to St. Acacius at this period, and which it was in which John Chrysostom actually preached if there was more than one. The key point here is that, taken together, the evidence does support the existence of a cult of St. Acacius at Constantinople c.400, even if, in isolation, one might well question whether the titles of Chrysostom's homilies might not have been amended by a late editor to refer to a "Church of St. Acacius" rather than a "Church of Acacius", an important distinction as we shall see next.

[11] Eus. *VC* 3.52. This is a letter in which Constantine I himself describes Acacius as a "most distinguished count and friend". See *PLRE* 1, p. 6, s.v. Acacius 4. This Acacius may be identifiable with the Acacius who was *comes Macedoniae* in 327, *C.Th.* 11.3.2. We do not know anything about the date or circumstances of his death, which raises the possibility that the story about the hanging of St. Acacius on a walnut-tree may actually relate to him instead. If so, one is tempted to associate his execution with that of other of Constantine I's favourites immediately after his death. In general, see M. DiMaio, "*Per vim, per caedem, per bellum*: A Study of Murder and Ecclesiastical Politics in the Year 337 AD", *Byzantion* 62 (1992), 158-211.

bishop there c.326.[12] Hence a church originally known as the "Church of Acacius" after its founder may have become known as the "Church of St. Acacius" in time by the same process which saw the creation of several fictitious saints in other cities also.[13] The difference this time, though, was that there was a genuine martyr whose passion could be used to explain the origin of the name of the "Church of St. Acacius" at Constantinople without recourse to the worst excesses of pious fiction, the Acacius who had originally been martyred at Nicomedia.

Support for this thesis can also be found in the location of the so-called "Church of St. Acacius", the place where his body was supposed to lie according to Socrates. Acacius' passion records that he was buried in a place called The Staurion, and although its exact location has not yet been discovered, it is generally agreed that it was located near the Golden Horn and within the Constantinian walls.[14] The interesting point here is that the Church of St. Mocius, a priest who was also martyred at Constantinople during the Diocletianic persecution, lay outside the Constantinian walls in the opposite direction.[15] In so far as we may assume that it was built at or near the site of Mocius' burial, this suggests that the cemetery in use at the time of the Diocletianic persecution was far removed from the alleged burial site of St. Acacius, i.e. that he could not have been buried at the site of the so-called "Church of St. Acacius" had he really died at Constantinople. This raises the question whether the "Church of St. Acacius" did not get its name instead as a result of the translation there at some point of his relics from Nicomedia. For example, the earthquake which devastated Nicomedia in 358 and killed its bishop Cecropius may have provided one opportunity for such action.[16] This was a time when all concerned were

---

[12] Eus. *VC* 3.62.

[13] E.g. the Pudens who founded the late 4th-century *titulus Pudentis* at Rome, or the *ecclesia Pudentiana* as it was described in a mosaic, had been transformed into a saint by the 6th century, as had the founders of many other *tituli*. He was then identified with his homonym at 2 *Tim.* 4.21. In general, see R. Krautheimer, S. Corbett, and W. Frankl (eds.), *Corpus Basilicarum Romae III* (Vatican, 1967), pp. 277-302.

[14] R. Janin, *Constantinople Byzantine: Développement urbain et repertoire topographique* (Paris, 1950), p. 343.

[15] The church has not itself been found, but it is assumed to have lent its name to the so-called Cistern of St. Mocius allegedly built by Anastasius I (491-518).

[16] Soz. *HE* 4.16.5. If this earthquake has any relevance at all, it is probably because it provides the best explanation of why the church at Constantinople was able to succeed in its claim that Acacius had really died there. One suspects that it probably destroyed whatever shrine the real St. Acacius had already merited at Nicomedia, so

anxious to enhance the dignity of Constantinople by acquiring new relics for its churches, as witnessed by the translation there of the relics of Ss. Luke and Andrew in 359,[17] but it remains difficult to explain why no source attests such a translation if it did in fact occur. More importantly, while it is obvious why all concerned should have been eager to acquire the relics of the apostle Andrew in particular for the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, it is not clear why they should have wished to obtain those of St. Acacius, unless they had a church named after an Acacius whom they were already identifying with the martyr from Nicomedia, which returns us to my original thesis.[18]

This brings us to the surviving passion of St. Acacius. This no more proves the truth of the *Hieronymian Martyrology* in this matter than does Socrates' testimony. In fact, it proves the opposite to be true. If one ignores the wordy excesses of this passion as it survives, and concentrates on those basic elements of the narrative which most probably preserve the earliest features of this tradition, then one allegation more than anything else causes one to doubt whether this text preserves anything of value, the claim that Acacius' persecutors sent him for trial from Perinthus to the proconsul of Europa, Flaccinus, at Byzantium.[19] Ignoring the fact that the governor of

---

removing the locus for celebration and effectively extinguishing the cult before it had gained sufficient popular momentum to continue. One is inclined to believe that if St. Acacius' shrine at Nicomedia had ever possessed his relics, then they were probably buried for good at this time. For the extent of the destruction, see Amm. Marc. 17.7.1-8, 22.9.3-4.

[17] See D. Woods, "The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople", *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991), 286-92. These were the first relics known to have been translated to Constantinople.

[18] It is noteworthy that there is no evidence that the "Church of St. Acacius" ever did possess any corporeal relics which it was able either to display or divide for redistribution elsewhere. One is reminded of the growth of the cult of St. Demetrius at Thessalonica despite the fact that the authorities there had no corporeal relics to substantiate their claims and simply assumed, in time, that their patron was buried somewhere beneath his church. See J.C. Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th-7th Centuries CE* (Harrisburg, 1999), pp. 85-88. But if the "Church of St. Acacius" did possess the remains of a certain Acacius, i.e. if there was a tomb of a certain Acacius present there for all to see, then it need not to have been the tomb of the martyr rather than of some dignitary of this name whose wealth and prestige had ensured his burial within the church itself, the donor of the church even as I will argue next.

[19] *PG* 115, col. 237. The 11th-century *Synaxary of Constantinople* preserves a corrupt reading of his name as Falcillianus, while failing to preserve his full title. See H. Delehaye (ed.), *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris* (Brussels, 1902), p. 661.

the late Roman province of Europa did not rank as a proconsul, only as a consularis, even by c.401,[20] one notes that Perinthus was the capital of the province of Europa, and that his immediate superiors ought not to have had to send Acacius anywhere had they merely wanted to deliver him to the authority of the provincial governor. The solution to this problem lies in the realisation that the Flaccinus of the passion is identifiable with the Flaccinus whom Lactantius identifies as prefect in 303.[21] The context of Lactantius' statement proves that Flaccinus was present at Nicomedia in 303 as the praetorian prefect of either Diocletian or Galerius Maximianus.[22] It is arguable, therefore, that the passion of Acacius had originally described his transfer to the jurisdiction of the praetorian prefect Flaccinus at Nicomedia, but that Flaccinus' title and the location where he presided over Acacius' trial were changed at a later stage in the tradition in order to support Constantinople's new claim upon this martyr. Hence the passion lends credence to the *Syriac Breviary*'s claim that Acacius died in Nicomedia.

The realisation that the passion of St. Acacius deserves more credence than it has hitherto received and that its worst problems can be explained as the result of Constantinopolitan re-editing at an early date in order to support its claim to possess the relics of St. Acacius requires a brief re-examination of the evidence for the date of his death.[23] The fact that Flaccinus tried Acacius at Nicomedia proves that the emperor whom he served must have been present at Nicomedia also. More specifically, since

---

[20] *Not. Dig. Or.* 1.72.

[21] Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 16.4. Lactantius' work has left no traces in the Byzantine historiographical tradition, and there is no possibility that the author of the passion borrowed Flaccinus' name from this text.

[22] T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), p. 126.

[23] Another problem which has resulted from the re-editing of this passion down the ages is the description of Acacius as a centurion. The passion reports that Acacius belonged to a unit called the Martenses, but we can now identify this as one of the new type of units raised by Diocletian during his reforms of the army and which did not include this traditional grade. See, e.g., W. Treadgold, *Byzantium and Its Army 284-1081* (Stanford, 1995), p. 90. In fact, the passion describes Acacius as a centurion on one occasion only, in a passage where an attempt to translate the Roman title *Martenses* as Ἀρείοι in Greek reveals a late hand at work (*PG* 115, col. 220, ch. 2). Otherwise Acacius is described simply as a "soldier" (στρατιώτης), which should have been interpreted to mean "private" in the modern military sense, i.e. as a description of rank as much as occupation, although a later editor clearly failed to realise this. This would bring the passion into agreement with the evidence of the *Hieronymian Martyrology* which also describes Acacius as a *miles*, i.e. a "private".

the *Syriac Breviary* commemorates his feast on 10 May, Acacius must have been executed in a year when an emperor remained present at Nicomedia up to 10 May at least. Since Diocletian and his Caesar Galerius Maximianus had both left Nicomedia by mid-March 303, this excludes that year.[24] Diocletian only returned to Nicomedia during late 304, and Galerius only returned there in March 305. They then remained together at Nicomedia until 1 May 305 when Diocletian declared Galerius his successor as senior emperor and retired to private life. While there is no clear evidence for the whereabouts of Galerius in 306, the fact that he fought a campaign against the Sarmatians either in late 306 or early 307 and was able to invade Italy itself in the summer of 307, suggests that he had returned to his European possessions shortly after his accession as Augustus. Certainly, there is no evidence for his return to Nicomedia after the summer of 305. Hence the evidence suggests that Acacius was martyred on 10 May 305.

In conclusion, the evidence suggests that the so-called "Church of St. Acacius" at Constantinople was originally known as the "Church of Acacius", after its founder, one of Constantine I's most senior Christian officials. It was only at a later date that it came to be associated with St. Acacius of Nicomedia, a process which was complete by c.400 at latest. The surprisingly short time-scale involved here is reminiscent of a similar misunderstanding concerning the Church of St. Paul at Constantinople. This church was named after bishop Paul of Constantinople (342-50) when his remains were finally returned to his see and laid to rest there c.381. Yet Sozomen reveals that by his day c.440 many people believed that the church really took its name from the apostle St. Paul and that it was his remains which it possessed.[25] Hence the *Syriac Breviary* and the *Hieronymian Martyrology* do not so much contradict one another as provide an insight into a key stage in the transformation of the cult of St. Acacius as a result of the acquisitiveness of Constantine's new capital at the expense of its neighbour and rival Nicomedia.[26]

Dpt of Ancient Classics University College Cork, Eire

---

[24] For what follows, see Barnes (n. 22) on Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 17-19.

[25] Soz. *HE* 7.10; also Soc. *HE* 5.9.

[26] In general, see C. Foss, "Nicomedia and Constantinople", in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and Its Hinterland* (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 181-90.

PATRISTISCHER HINTERGRUND IM 12. GEISTLICHEN LIED DES NOVALIS

VON

VINZENZ BUCHHEIT

Bekanntlich hat das 12. Geistliche Lied des Novalis[1] das katholische Kirchenlied „O Heyland, reiß die Himmel auff" des Jesuiten Friedrich von Spee mit dem Titel „Der Altväter Verlangen nach dem Messias" zum Vorbild.[2] Wiederholt hat man auch auf die Einwirkung der frühromantischen Religiosität hingewiesen.[3] Übersehen ist bislang, dass der Dichter, auf welchem Weg auch immer, von einer Tradition Kenntnis gehabt hat, wie sie frühchristliche Exegese und Dichtung zu erkennen geben.

Wo bleibst du Trost der ganzen Welt?
Herberg ist dir schon längst bestellt.
Verlangend sieht ein jedes dich,
Und öffnet deinem Segen sich.

Geuß, Vater, ihn gewaltig aus,
Gib ihn aus deinem Arm heraus:
Nur Unschuld, Lieb und süße Scham
Hielt ihn, daß er nicht längst schon kam.

Treib ihn von dir in unsern Arm,
Daß er von deinem Hauch noch warm;
In schweren Wolken sammle ihn
Und laß ihn so hernieder ziehn.

In kühlen Strömen send ihn her,
In Feuerflammen lodre er,
In Luft und Öl, in Klang und Tau
Durchdring er unsrer Erde Bau.

---

[1] HKA I[3]. Leicht zugänglich auch in der Reclam-Ausgabe von J. Mahr, *Novalis. Gedichte. Die Lehrlinge zu Sais*, (Stuttgart 1984) 118f.

[2] Vgl. u.a. W. Vesper, Das Vorbild zu Hardenbergs ‚Wo bleibst du Trost der ganzen Welt', *Euphorion* 15 (1908) 568-570; H. Uerlings, *Friedrich von Hardenberg, genannt Novalis. Werk und Forschung*, (Stuttgart 1991) 264-270.

[3] Zuletzt bes. Uerlings a.O. 264ff.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001
Vigiliae Christianae 55, 208-214

So wird der heilge Kampf gekämpft,
So wird der Hölle Grimm gedämpft,
Und ewig blühend geht allhier
Das alte Paradies herfür.

Die Erde regt sich, grünt und lebt,
Des Geistes voll ein jedes strebt
Den Heiland lieblich zu empfahn
Und beut die vollen Brüst ihm an.

Der Winter weicht, ein neues Jahr
Steht an der Krippe Hochaltar.
Es ist das erste Jahr der Welt,
Die sich dies Kind erst selbst bestellt.

Die Augen sehn den Heiland wohl,
Und doch sind sie des Heilands voll,
Von Blumen wird sein Haupt geschmückt,
Aus denen er selbst holdselig blickt.

Er ist der Stern, er ist die Sonn,
Er ist des ewgen Lebens Bronn,
Aus Kraut und Stein und Meer und Licht
Schimmert sein kindlich Angesicht.

In allen Dingen sein kindlich Tun.
Seine heiße Liebe wird nimmer ruhn,
Er schmiegt sich seiner unbewußt
Unendlich fest an jede Brust.

Ein Gott für uns, ein Kind für sich
Liebt er uns all herzinniglich,
Wird unsre Speis und unser Trank,
Treusinn ist ihm der liebste Dank.

Das Elend wächst je mehr und mehr,
Ein düstrer Gram bedrückt uns sehr,
Laß, Vater, den Geliebten gehn,
Mit uns wirst du ihn wieder sehn. (HKA I)

Während die adventlichen Aspekte bei Spee weitgehend von Jesaias her (45,8 *rorate, caeli, desuper et nubes pluant iustum; aperiatur terra, et germinet Salvatorem, et iustitia oriatur simul*) verständlich werden, ist dies bei Novalis keineswegs der Fall. Er hat den entscheidenden Passus (*rorate, caeli . . .*) *allenfalls* in den Versen fünf („*Geuß, Vater, ihn gewaltig aus*") und elf („*in schweren Wolken sammle ihn*") anklingen lassen. Ansonsten ist die starke Divergenz von Spee durch die bereits erwähnte Deutung der Väter mitbestimmt worden.

Dies betrifft insbesondere den Mittelteil mit dem soteriologischen Aspekt „So *ward der heilge Kampf gekämpft, so wird der Hölle Grimm gedämpft*", der fester Bestandteil christlicher Exegese in Weihnachts- und Osterhymnen bzw. – Homilien war.[4] Wichtiger ist freilich, dass der Dichter diesen in der christlichen Soteriologie[5] insgesamt geläufigen Hintergrund ergänzt durch die dadurch erzielte Wirkung:

Und ewig blühend geht allhier
Das alte Paradies herfür. (19f.).

Die Erde regt sich, grünt und lebt,
Des Geistes voll ein jedes strebt ... (21ff.)

Dies basiert generell auf einer kosmischen Christophanie, wie sie im Hymnus insgesamt vorwaltet. Eine solche muss aber nicht durch Jakob Böhme veranlasst sein,[6] sondern ist schon in frühchristlicher Exegese und in Weihnachtshymnen angelegt.[7] Vor allem das bei Novalis anklingende dreiphasige Weltmodell (frühlingshaft-paradiesische Urphase – Verlust – dauerhafte und gesteigerte Wiederkehr des ursprünglichen Paradieses), illustriert mit Hilfe des Frühlingsmotivs, hat schon das frühe Christentum unter Verwertung vergilischer Ansätze[8] aus biblischem Hintergrund entwickelt.[9]

Da ist zunächst auf einen grundsätzlichen Aspekt hinzuweisen, der fest in der Bibel verankert ist:[10] Nach patristischer Vorstellung gehören alle Naturerscheinungen deshalb zu den *optima*, weil Gott ihr Urgrund (*auctor naturae*)[11] ist. Dies war verbunden mit der Tendenz, die natürliche Ebene, ohne sie zu entwerten, durch die spirituelle zu überhöhen, so dass Frühlingselemente auf doppelter Ebene auslegbar werden. Zu Hilfe kam den symbolfreudigen Vätern ein weiterer Symbolbereich, der mit ‚Acker –

---

[4] Nachweise bei V. Buchheit, Göttlicher Heilsplan bei Prudentius (Cath. 11, 25-48), *Vig. Christ.* 44 (1990) 227ff.

[5] Lit. bei Verf., *Vig. Christ.* 44 (1990) 239, Anm. 114; vgl. nur den von Picaneder stammenden Schlußchor im Weihnachtsoratorium von J.S. Bach.

[6] So Paschek bei Uerlings a.O. 266, Anm. 38.

[7] Vgl. V. Buchheit, Sonnenwende – Geburt des Sol verus (Prud. Cath. 11, 1-22), *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff.

[8] Nachweise bei V. Buchheit, Heimkehr ins Paradies, *Philologus* 136, (1992) 256-273, bes. 257ff., 267ff.

[9] Vgl. bes. *Gen.* 1f.: *Psalm.* 18,1; *Sap.* 13,5; *Joh. 1; Röm.* 1,20; 8, 19ff.; *Ephes.* 1,10; *Koloss.* 1, 15ff.; ferner V. Buchheit, Goldene Zeit und Paradies auf Erden (Laktanz, inst. 5, 5-8), *Würzb. Jahrb.* 4 (1978) 161-185; 5 (1979) 219-235.

[10] Texte wie Anm. 9

[11] Tert. *Cult. Fem.* 1, 8, 2.

Pflanzung – Wachstum' umschrieben werden kann: Christus ist der Sämann, Kirche und Seele sind Acker und Pflanzung.[12] Ebenso hilfreich wurde, dass auch der frühchristlichen Exegese die Annahme geläufig war, die Urschöpfung habe sich im Frühling vollzogen.[13] Folgerichtig spielten die reale Ebene des Frühlingsgeschehens und ihre spirituelle Deutung bei der liturgischen Ausgestaltung des Osterfestes, der Taufe und des Weihnachtsfestes eine besondere Rolle.[14] Für Letzteres stützte man sich vor allem auf den Taufpsalm 22, Vers 2: *in loco pascuae* bzw. *in loco viridi . . . me locavit.*

Dichterische Gestaltung gefunden hat dies in zwei Tagesliedern des Prudentius. In seinem Hymnus auf das Weihnachtsfest (cath. 11) sind bislang erwähnte Vorstellungen zu bildhafter Dichte vereint. Die Wiederkehr des Paradieses setzt ein mit der Geburt des Messias, wobei kosmisches Geschehen der Wintersonnenwende und heilsgeschichtliche Ausdeutung zusammenfinden:[15] Eine große Freude für die Welt enthalte der reine Schoß Mariens, aus dem ein *novellum saeculum* hervorgehe und eine *lux aurea* (11,57ff.). Das Ereignis ist geschildert mit den Farben der goldenen Zeit. Anklänge an Vergiltexte ordnen sich der aus AT und NT gewonnenen Deutung unter. Der Schrei des Neugeborenen habe die Erneuerung des Erdkreises im Frühling hervorgebracht, die wiedergeborene Erde den Schmutz der alten vertrieben. Die Wirkung war:

Sparsisse tellurem reor
Rus omne densis floribus.

Auch in der ganzen unbelebten Natur habe sich das Wunder der Erneuerung vollzogen, und der Menschheit sei der Weg zur Heimkehr ins Paradies eröffnet worden.

Im achten Tageslied (cath. 8) begegnet diese Symbolik bei der Deutung der Fabel vom Guten Hirten (8,33-48).[16] Die darauf bezogenen beiden ersten Strophen handeln von der Verstrickung des unerlösten Menschen in die schuldhafte Gottferne und von der Befreiung daraus durch den Guten Hirten (8,33-40). Die beiden folgenden Strophen führen den Vorgang

---

[12] Vgl. *Philologus* 136 (1992) 263f.

[13] Ebda, 264. 266; dazu Aponius, Komm. z. Hohen Lied (*Cant. 2, 11* = Migne, PL Suppl. 1, 866f.).

[14] Vgl. Th. Michels, Das Frühjahrssymbol in österlicher Liturgie, Rede und Dichtung des christlichen Altertums, *Jahrb. Liturgiewiss.* 6 (1926) 1-15 = *Sarmenta. Gesammelte Studien von Th. M.* (Münster 1972) 1-15; Buchheit, *Philologus* 136 (1992) 257ff.

[15] Im Einzelnen erläutert bei Buchheit, *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff.

[16] Dazu Verf., Ovis spinosa (Prud. cath. 8, 33-40), *Philologus* 134 (1990) 50-65.

der Erlösung durch die Taufe vor Augen: „Auch bringt er (Christus) das Schaf wieder auf Wiesen und grüne Auen (*et pratis viridique campo*) zurück, wo kein Dorn mit struppigen Kletten zittert und keine stachlige Distel ihre Sprösslinge mit Dornen bewaffnet. Vielmehr gedeiht ein Hain voller Palmen, und das wiedergewonnene Laub auf den Stengeln grünt neu im Frühling (*vernat*); immergrüner Lorbeer umschattet den gläsernen Strom voll lebendigen Wassers".

Erneut sind die realen Erscheinungen in der Natur und der spirituelle Sinn zu eindringlicher Einheit geführt: Frühling – Vegetation – Taufe – Erlösung – Heimkehr ins Paradies. Ist im Weihnachtshymnus der Frühling als Zeichen einer universalkosmischen Erneuerung verstanden, wird im achten Tageslied die Teilnahme des Einzelnen an dieser neuen Frühlingswelt erkennbar. Es überrascht nicht, dass Prudentius auch schon das Ursprungsparadies in Eden mit ähnlichen Farben geschildert hat:

Tunc per amoena virecta iubet
frondicomis habitare locis,
ver ubi perpetuum redolet,
prataque multicolora latex
quadrifluo celer amne rigat (cath. 3, 101-105).[17]

(„Dann lädt er ihn ein, auf lieblich – grüner Au in laubgeschmückter Flur zu wohnen, wo sich der Duft ewigen Frühlings verströmt und ein eilendes Wasser in vierfacher Strömung buntfarbene Wiesen benetzt")

Einen ähnlichen Bezugsrahmen kann man im Lied des Novalis für die inhaltlich sich anschließenden Verse 25ff. ermitteln:

Der Winter weicht, ein neues Jahr
Steht an der Krippe Hochaltar . . .

Den Ausgangspunkt für das Verständnis bilden Psalm. 73, 16f.: . . . *aestatem et ver tu plasmasti ea*, sowie Cant. 2, 11-13: *iam enim hiems transiit . . . flores apparuerunt in terra nostra, tempus putationis advenit. . . .* Beide Texte sind in der Exegese stets auf Christus als den Schöpfer von Winter und Frühling und den Bringer des geistigen Frühlings der Erlösung bezogen. Aus der Fülle der Belege seien exemplarisch die Folgenden ausgewählt:

Gregor von Nyssa lässt in seinem Kommentar zum Hohen Lied[18] die letzte Stufe seiner dreiphasigen Heilsgeschichte beginnen mit dem Kommen Christi, das den Frühling der Seelen geschenkt und so das Aufblühen der

[17] Ähnlich Cento Probae 163 (wozu Verf., *Grazer Beitr.* 15 (1988) 173); Mar. Vict. *Aleth.* I 225ff.; Isid. Sev. *Etym.* 14, 3, 2; Abaelard, *Hexah.* (Migne, PL 178, 750a).

[18] *In Cant.* V p. 151 sqq. Langerbeck (zu Cant. 2, 11f.).

Tugenden bewirkt habe. Ambrosius erläutert in seinem Kommentar zum Hexahemeron (4, 5, 22):[19] *ante adventum Christi hiems erat, post adventum flores sunt veris.* Zeno von Verona spricht in einer Predigt zum Ostersonntag[20] nach der Ausmalung der Frühlingszeit von der Notwendigkeit der Taufe, die er als *ver, sacrum fontem* bezeichnet; ihre Folge seien *ecclesiae flores clarissimi.* In einer Weihnachtshomilie, die Johannes Chrysostomos zugeschrieben wird (Migne, PG 61, 763), werden realer und heilsgeschichtlicher Frühling aufeinander bezogen: „Wenn nach kaltem Winter die warme Milde des Frühlings aufbricht, sprießt Vegetation, erfasst die Schöpfung insgesamt Freude und Wandel zum Besseren. Dass uns aber nun Christus, der himmlische Frühling . . ., aufgeleuchtet ist und die frostigen und stürmischen Wolken des Teufels verjagt und die schläfrigen Herzen der Menschen aus dem Nebel der Unwissenheit durch sein göttliches Licht zum Leben erweckt sind, lässt uns unseren Sinn aufrichten hin zur Glückseligkeit der himmlischen Herrlichkeit".[21]

Dieses Ineinander von Wintersolstitium – Geburt Christi – Heilsgeschehen ist in dieser Art weder bei Jakob Böhme[22] noch im pietistischen Umfeld des Novalis belegt, sondern entstammt der erwähnten patristischen Tradition, die gerade über die Auslegung des Hohen Liedes im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit bis hin zu Herder,[23] mit dem Novalis wie fast alle bedeutenden Zeitgenossen bestens vertraut war, geläufig blieb.

Und Christus als Stern und Sonne (*er ist der Stern, er ist die Sonn*, V. 39) ist in der reichen Lichtmetaphorik und -symbolik des Weihnachtsgeschehens spätestens seit dem vierten Jahrhundert, gefördert durch zahlreiche alt- wie neutestamentliche Texte, sowie durch das Rivalisieren mit dem paganen *Sol invictus*,[24] fest verankert.

---

[19] Vgl. ferner *Virgin*, 54; *Isaac*, 4, 35f. und oft.

[20] *Tract.* 1,33 Löfstedt = 2,45 Migne; vgl. *tract.* 2,13 Löfstedt = 2,53 Migne; die *salubris unda* (Taufe) habe in einem *ver arridens diversos flores* hervorgebracht. – Auch Augustinus war diese Winter-Frühling-Metaphorik vertraut; mir lagen die Lemmata der gespeicherten Wortkonkordanz zu Augustinus vor.

[21] Dabei begegnet erstmals das Bild vom ‚Frühling des Herzens', das bei Hölderlin so nachdrücklich hervortritt (Gregor v. Nyssa, *Komm. z. Hohen Lied* 2, 11f.; Ambros. *Virgin.* 54).

[22] Dessen Mitwirkung bei der Entfaltung dieses Symbolbereichs durch Novalis regelmäßig überschätzt wird.

[23] Hierzu Buchheit, *Wien.Stud.* 99 (1986) 246ff.; zur Deutungsgeschichte des Hohen Liedes s. u. a. F. Ohly, *Hoheliedstudien* (Wiesbaden 1958); U. Köpf, *TRE* 15, 508-513 (512f. Lit.).

[24] Dazu Buchheit, Sonnenwende – Geburt des Sol verus (Prud. cath. 11, 1-12), *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff. Auch das zwölfte Geistliche Lied legt Zeugnis ab für Novalis durchgängige Tendenz, christliche und heidnische Religion miteinander auszusöhnen.

Insgesamt ist festzuhalten, dass die Struktur des in dem zwölften Geistlichen Lied erkennbaren Weltmodells und die Frühlingsmetaphorik ihren Rückhalt im gesamten Werk des Novalis haben. Schon der frühe Dichter idealisiert die Urzeit als eine göttlich-frühlingshafte Phase und lässt in ihr die Poesie entstehen.[25] Gemäß triadischem Weltbild des Novalis[26] bedeutet dies, dass seine Poesie und der sie wirkende Dichter Träger und Vermittler dieser frühlingshaften, will sagen ursprünglich goldenen Zeit sind und den Auftrag haben, ihrer Zeit den verlorenen Urzustand neu zu vermitteln. Kein Wunder, dass wir dem so verstandenen Frühlingsmotiv im späteren Werk immer dann begegnen, wenn der Dichter solche Wegweisung entfaltet, so vor allem in den ‚Lehrlingen zu Sais' (HKA I³ 94), im ‚Heinrich von Ofterdingen' (HKA I³ 224f., 270f., 312f.), in den Gedichten ‚Der Fremdling' und ‚An Tieck'.

Darüber hinaus ist Hardenberg mit dem Frühlingsmotiv, wie es uns besonders bei Vergil und Hölderlin begegnet,[27] wohlvertraut. Erinnert sei nur an die häufig verwendeten Motivkreise ‚Kind und Frühling',[28] ‚Liebe und Frühling'[29] und daran, dass auch Novalis die Vorstellung kennt, einige wenige, denen die Seele der Natur noch vertraut ist, reichten mit ihren Wurzeln in die frühlingshafte Urzeit zurück und bildeten so die Keimzelle des „neuen Reiches", in dem ewiger Frühling herrschen werde: die ‚Fremdlinge' aus Atlantis, die Dichter und Weisen.

Dass sich diese Motivik bei Vergil, Hölderlin[30] und Novalis gleichermaßen findet, hat mit der Gleichgestimmtheit verwandter Dichternaturen zu tun und basiert auf demselben dreiphasigen Weltmodell.

35392 Gießen, Am Zollstock 15 VINZENZ BUCHHEIT

---

[25] Vgl. Buchheit, Scaliger und Novalis über den Ursprung von Musik und Dichtung, *Würzb. Jahrb.* 20 (1994/95) 257-271.

[26] Dazu grundlegend H.J. Mähl, *Die Idee des goldenen Zeitalters im Werk des Novalis* (Heidelberg 1965); Ders.; Der poetische Staat, in: Utopieforschung (Frankfurt 1985) Bd. 3, 273-302.

[27] Vgl. Buchheit, Frühling bei Vergil und Hölderlin, *Euphorion* 91 (1997) 157-181.

[28] So neben dem zwölften Geistlichen Lied auch in ‚Die Lehrlinge zu Sais', im ‚Heinrich von Ofterdingen' und in ‚An Tieck'.

[29] Vgl. nur die Fabel ‚Giasar und Azora', mit wörtlichen Bezügen wieder im Märchen ‚Hyazint und Rosenblütchen' aufgenommen (HAK I³ 94f.), in ‚Die Blumen', mehrfach im Ofterdingenroman und in ‚Es färbte sich die Wiese grün'. Dieses Gedicht ist in Struktur und Aussage von Hölderlins Thaliafragment (*StA* III 167ff.) und dem ‚Hyperion' (*StA* III 47ff.) beeinflusst.

[30] Für Novalis ist direkte Kenntnis der Hymnen des Prudentius durchaus denkbar, möglicherweise durch Herder vermittelt; vgl. J.G. Herder, *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität, 7. Sammlung*, Nr. 82 = Bd. 18, S. 15, hrsg. v. B. Suphan: Herder zitiert aus cath. 10.

REVIEWS

P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth, R. Skarsten, *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria.* Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, and Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2000. xi + 371 pages. ISBN 0-8028-3883-9 (Eerdmans), 90-04-11477-7 (Brill). $55.

The Jewish exegete and philosopher Philo of Alexandria had a strong impact on the thought and exegesis of the writers of the early Church. Therefore his writings are of great relevance to patristic scholars. Among the more important instruments available for consulting his voluminous oeuvre are indices. The first index was compiled by I. Leisegang and was published as volume seven of the critical edition of Philo's writings by L. Cohn, P. Wendland, and S. Reiter (Berlin 1926, 1930). In this index each lemma is subdivided according to the different meanings of a word, and the context of a word is cited. Therefore, it is a very useful tool but it has the disadvantage that it refers to page and line numbers of the critical edition; so it can only be consulted in combination with that edition. Moreover it is incomplete, only containing key words. In 1974 G. Mayer published his index, which shows two important differences compared with Leisegang's index. It does not indicate the context of a word and the entries are not subdivided. Mayer, using numbers for indicating the writings, refers to the paragraph numbering.

In 1997 a group of Norwegian Philonic scholars published a printout of a database containing all the Greek words in Philo's writings. This index has now been published in a definite form by Eerdmans and Brill. The book has a hard cover and a fine layout. The letters and numbers are large enough for comfortable use. The index resembles Mayer's one, but differs from its predecessor in some respects. It is even more complete, containing all the Greek words, except δέ, καί, and ὁ. At each entry the total number of occurrences is also given. It includes the main Greek fragments from *Quaestiones in Genesim et Exodum, De Providentia* and *Hypothetica.* References to the Philonic writings are made by abbreviations of the titles, and not by numbers.

I shall now give an example how a patristic scholar can use this index. In his work *De vita Moysis* the Cappadocian Church father Gregory of

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Nyssa connects the royal way (Num. 20:17, 21:22) with the Aristotelian ethical doctrine that virtue is found in the middle between two extremities (II.288). As remarked by the commentators, Gregory derives this interpretation form Philo's *Quod Deus immutabilis sit* 162-164. He does, however, not only offer a Philonic exegesis, but he uses also Philonic words. The highway of virtue is contrasted with ἀνοδία—a road that is no road. The word ἀνοδία is not frequently used; LSJ refers to a few writers, among whom Philo. A search in the Philo index shows that Philo employs this word twenty times, and so it seems that it is characteristic of Philo. Both Philo and Gregory employ the word ἀνοδία in a metaphorical way for indicating the deviation from the highway of virtue. The Philonic character of the passage in Gregory's *De vita Moysis* is strengthened by his use of the word ἀνοδία.

The Philo index is a fine achievement of the Norwegian Philo group. I am certain that it will be a most valuable tool for tracing Philonic influence in the Church fathers, and for this reason indispensable for patristic scholars engaged in such research.

NL-4206 VD *Gorinchem*, IJsbaan 175 A.C. GELJON

Avit de Vienne, *Histoire spirituelle. Tome I (Chants I-III)*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Nicole Hecquet-Noti (Sources Chrétiennes 444), Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 334 p., FF 173 (broché).

Alexander Arweiler, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritalis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus. Mit einem Kommentar zu Avit. carm. 4, 429-540 und 5, 526-703* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 52), Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1999. 384 p., DM 248 (Geb.).

Sans aucun doute l'épopée chrétienne a droit à l'existence. On y trouve des histoires bibliques en forme poétique, racontées par des hommes érudits et versés dans la culture classique. Bien qu'il aille sans dire que les poètes chrétiens n'atteignent pas le niveau de leurs grands prédécesseurs païens, ils arrivent bien à ajouter quelque chose d'originel à leur exemples. Grâce à leur volonté d'*aemulatio* il leur est donné de 'corriger' les *mendacia poetarum*.

Parmi ces versificateurs chrétiens se trouve Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, évêque de Vienne (près de Lyon) qui publie aux alentours de l'an 500 un texte intitulé *De spiritalis historiae gestis ('Histoire sprituelle')*. Cette oeuvre comprend cinq chants: 1. Le début du monde; 2. Le péché originel; 3. Le

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

jugement divin; 4. Le déluge; 5. La traversée de la Mer Rouge. But du poème est la glorification du Christ comme héros universel.

En 1999 deux publications sur l'épopée d'Avit ont vu le jour. On pourrait donc assumer un intérêt renouvelé pour cet ouvrage merveilleux. A paru dans la collection dite des *Sources Chrétiennes* N. Hecquet-Noti, *Avit de Vienne—Histoire spirituelle. Tome I (Chants I-III)*. Ce livre est le résultat d'un remaniement d'une thèse de doctorat soutenue en 1994 à l'université de Genève. Que ces quelques remarques suffisent à juger ce travail à ses mérites. 1. On cherche en vain dans la bibliographie l'étude fondamentale de H. Hagendahl, *The Latin Fathers and the Classics*, Göteborg 1958. 2. P. 227: Le vers II, 299 est: *illis subpeteret recta si sorte potestas*. De vue prosodique on devrait lier *recta* à *sorte* et traduire: 'si le pouvoir leur était donné par un juste sort' etc. N'empêche que ce numéro des *Sources Chrétiennes* fournisse à l'étudiant d'Avit une bonne occasion de se familiariser avec cette poésie.

Il y aurait à dire bien davantage de la seconde publication: A. Arweiler, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritalis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus*. Remaniement lui aussi d'une thèse de doctorat (soutenu en 1997/98 à l'université de Bonn), ce livre volumineux témoigne d'une manque d'argumentation persévérée. On y trouve bien une introduction mais aucune conclusion. Il se pourrait que la version originale pourvoirât à combler cette lacune, mais le lecteur ingénu n'y apprend rien. Aux pages 340-1 se trouve un passage qui pourrait être conçu comme une argumentation: 'PEIPER hat in seinem Index besonders viele Parallelen aus den Werken des Vergil und Sidonius angeführt. Daraus ist die These, Avit. habe diese beiden Autoren zu Hauptvorbilden gewählt, als Tatsache in die Handbücher übernommen worden. Sie kann aber nach den in dieser Arbeit bisher vorgelegten Ergebnissen nur noch stark relativierte Geltung beanspruchen, da sie der complexen Imitationstechnik des Avit. nicht gerecht wird'. Cette remarque, tout en excitant la curiosité, semble aussitôt être oubliée par l'auteur, qui imperturbablement continue ses recherches détaillées. Cette conception d'Arweiler ne se rejouissant en aucun soutien argumentateur, il vaudrait mieux se tenir au propos de Hecquet-Noti, p. 38: 'Le modèle de cette poésie est, bien sûr, *l'Énéide*'.

En plus, le travail d'Arweiler contient des imprécisions. À la page 19, Avit. 4, 619 n'est pas correctement cité: il y a en trop le mot *post*. Les notes à la page 30 ne font aucune mention de l'édition de Cyprien Gallus (qu'Arweiler appelle 'der Heptateuchdichter'), à savoir *CSEL* 23. Un peu étonnant est l'orthographie du nom d'Avit: on lit 'Avitus' aussi bien que

'Avit.' et le génitif 'Avits'. Mieux vaudrait d'éviter dans le texte le nom abbrévié. Dans la bibliographie, les majuscules font souvent défaut dans les titres anglais. Par exemple, le titre de l'étude de M. Lapidge n'est pas *The binding of the kosmos* (*sic*), mais *The Binding of the Cosmos* etc. Les indices aussi ont quelques défauts. Ainsi, *l'Ilias latine* n'est pas citée au p. 297 mais au p. 292.

NL-3583 AD *Utrecht*, Adr. van Ostadelaan 109 B H.G. SCHIPPER

M. Heuser and H.-J. Klimkeit, *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*, translated by Majella Franzmann (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 46), Leiden: E.J. Brill 1998, ISBN 9004107169.

This volume of *Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies* brings together in English translation the works of two Bonn scholars, one at the beginning and one sadly at the end of a distinguished career cut short by an untimely death. The first part of the book (pp. 1-108) is an English translation of Heuser's doctoral dissertation on the main doctrinal issues (as far as a modern scholar could discern them) of Coptic Manichaean texts (especially of the [Berlin-]*Kephalaia*) and the second (pp. 111-313) is an eclectic collection of some of the most read and admired studies by Hans-Joachim Klimkeit on Eastern Manichaean texts (Middle Iranian, Turkish and Chinese). The approach of both scholars is religious-historical and not philological although both are familiar with the texts in their original languages (with the noted exception of Chinese; *vide infra*).

Mani had a habit of developing his elaborate cosmogonic teaching by endless repetition in his lectures to his disciples and students. The *Kephalaia*, the largest extant body of Manichaean didactic material, was, as W.-P. Funk had now convincingly demonstrated ('The Reconstruction of the Manichaean Kephalaia', in P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, edd., *Emerging from Darkness, Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, NHMS 43, Leiden, 1997, 151-52), put together by a major disciple of Mani, probably Adda, within one or two decades after the death of Mani. This major compilation has survived in two codices, one the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* (i.e. Mani) which is housed in Berlin and largely published, and the other the *Kephalaia of the Wisdom of my Lord Mani* which is housed in Dublin and largely unpublished. The work(s) would have reflected to a large extent the *ipsissima verba* of Mani as the compiler(s) would have had very little time to elaborate or compose fresh material for two such large collections.

Heuser's work is the first attempt to systematize the teaching of Mani, especially on cosmogony, soteriology, eschatology and numerology as found

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

in the (Berlin-)*Kephalaia*. His methodology is mainly exploratory and expository rather than interpretative but the results are obviously helpful to scholars who will otherwise have to wage through what is still a largely unindexed corpus of texts for relevant material. (For those who can read Coptic, however, there is now a Coptic Word-Index to all the fascicles of the (Berlin-)*Kephalaia* published up to 1966 by S. Clackson in *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, Vol. 1, *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum*, Subsidia II, Turnhout, 1998, pp. 59-185, with English Index.) Heuser basically follows a classic schema in his exposition of the Manichaean myth—and it is a great misfortune that the summary provided in the *Kephalaia* by Mani himself on this score is in a highly fragmentary state (pp. 1-9)—and explores the elaborations, schematizations and contradictions throughout the published *Kephalaia* (Chapters) which are not grouped originally round specific topics by its compiler(s). Heuser's endeavour will prove vital to those who wish to know for instance what the *Kephalaia* have to tell us about such Manichaean mythological characters/symbols as 'Three Garments' or 'Three Wheels' or 'Old and New Man'—terms which are not covered in the excellent parallel work of Paul van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Studies in Oriental Religions, 26) Wiesbaden, 1992—so long as the readers are familiar with where these figures occur in the classic schema of the myth as the book has no subject index. A particularly useful feature of Heuser's work is a numerological listing of Manichaean cosmogonic terms which are prefaced by numerals (pp. 98-106). These abound particularly in both Kephalaic and Central Asian texts and can be confusing to both new comer and expert on Manichaean texts.

The second part of the book is a selection of some of the most original contributions by Klimkeit published over the last two decades. These cover the Manichaeans' use of Scripture; their knowledge of (other) Christian scriptures; their use of special symbols (like the Gate/Door) or of Pauline metaphors like 'Old and New Man'; their attitude to Kingship; and their attempt to assimilate with Buddhism in Central Asia. The final section consists of two articles updating Klimkeit's earlier monograph on *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy* (Leiden, 1982) and some of the accompanying plates are also better reproduced than in his earlier work. The present reviewer would like to draw particular attention to the photographs of caves containing Manichaean paintings from Sängim as these had not previously been published. Klimkeit had the benefit of access to the pioneering work of Prof. Chao Huashan which is still little known in the West.

For the readers of this journal, the most important of these articles probably will be 'Apocryphal Gospels in Central Asia' (pp. 189-211). When the standard reference book on New Testament Apocrypha by his Bonn colleague W. Schneemelcher was revised and updated, the section on Gnostic Gospels and related literature was only marginally updated by Beate Blatz. Klimkeit's article came too late for it to be utilized in the latest edition of Hennecke-Schneemelcher and, for the time being, all scholars of Early Christian texts must treat this article by Klimkeit as a missing chapter of this standard reference work. The article examines the source of Manichaean citations and/or parallels from known and unknown Apocryphal works. Klimkeit's article is particularly useful in that it draws its material extensively from Central Asian sources which indicates the extent of the influence of Syriac Christianity on Manichaean texts in Parthian. Klimkeit, however, seemed to have been unaware of the excellent work of William Petersen on the use of the Diatessarōn by the Manichaeans as Petersen's work would have almost certainly helped to broaden his approach to the citations.

We are grateful to Prof. Majella Franzmann for making available in English these important works on Manichaeism by these two German scholars. But why are many key quotations from leading German scholars and from German translations of Manichaean texts left untranslated? See e.g. pp. 12, 52, 54, 76, 77 etc. The average English-speaking university student in courses on Religious History who are the most likely users of this book will be left dumb-founded by these occasional chunks of original Teutonic scholarship.

There is one unfortunate error on p. 219, line 2. Klimkeit had followed Chavannes and Pelliot's initial French translation of the Karabalghasun inscription and gave (in Franzmann's translation): '(Virtue) led the monks and nuns and entered the kingdom . . .'. The Chinese character for virtue 'de' is the last character used in the transliterated Manichaean rank-title of Mahistag—a term which was then not known in its Chinese form to Chavannes and Pelliot although Pelliot realized this immediately upon the discovery of the first part of the Compendium from Dunhuang. So it was not 'virtue' but a 'Mahistag' who helped to convert the Uighurs. The present reviewer had communicated this correction to Prof. Klimkeit personally on many occasions but clearly he had not passed it on to his translator.

Macquarie University,
School of History, Philosophy & Politics,
Sydney NSW 2109 (Australia)

SAMUEL N.C. LIEU

Richard Goulet (éd.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Tome 3, d'Eccélos à Juvénal. Éditions CNRS: Paris 2000, 1071 pages, ISBN 2-272-05748-5, FF 560.

After an interval of six years the third volume of Richard Goulet's magnificent repertory of ancient philosophers has appeared. The first volume, from Abam(m)on to Axiothea, appeared in 1989 and was reviewed in *Vigiliae* 44 (1990) 304-308. There is no need to repeat what was said there, except perhaps to articulate that it is neither a biographical nor a bibliographical work, but rather a combination of the two, a 'bio-bibliography', and also to remind the reader of the conclusion of the review, namely that it was a project that 'excites enthusiasm'. The second volume, from Babélyca to Dyscolius, was published in 1994. The third volume now proceeds to Juvenal. It contains 483 notices, making a total of about 1500 so far. Since at the outset we were told that a record of almost 4000 philosophers has been preserved in some form or other, it may be deduced that the project has not yet quite reached the half-way mark. But even that represents a quite remarkable achievement.

The present volume has 60 contributors, prominent among whom—in terms of numbers of lemmata prepared—are Goulet himself, Tiziano Dorandi, Bruno Centrone, Bernadette Puech, Luc Brisson, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Michèle Ducos and Pierre Maraval. Mention should be made of the Spanish scholar Pedro Pablo Fuentes González, on account of the very full treatment he has given important philosophers such as Epictetus, Eratosthenes, Hecataeus, Hippocrates of Chios and Isocrates. The lemma on Heraclitus by Serge Mouraviev is also outstanding in its length and thoroughness, though also somewhat deviating in its approach. As was the case for the previous volumes, there is a certain unevenness in method and detail of coverage, but this is inevitable in a composite work of this kind.

For patristic scholars the work continues to represent an instrument of great value for at least three reasons. Firstly it contains a considerable number of informative lemmata on Christian authors who have associations with ancient philosophy. The names of Epiphanius, Eunomius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Evagrius, Hermeias, Hermogenes, Hippolytus (a particularly valuable overview of this complex dossier by Daniel Bertrand), Hosius, Isidore of Seville, Justin (and Ps.Justin) and John of Damascus are the most prominent. As may be suspected from this list, not all church fathers important for the progress of ancient philosophy have been included. It is

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

perhaps regrettable, for example, that there is no lemma on the most philosophical of the Greek patres, Gregory of Nyssa. Goulet does not commit himself on whether John Stobaeus came from a Christian background (as his name seems to imply). Secondly there are extensive surveys of the lives and works of philosophers who play a significant role in the reception of Greek philosophy in the patres, e.g. Empedocles, Epicurus, Epictetus, Galen, Heraclitus, the *Hermetica*, Hippocrates, and so on. In the long lemma on Epictetus already mentioned above the splendid recently published edition by Gerard Boter (Leiden 1999) is mentioned as an addendum, but the information it contains on the important *Nachwirkung* of the *Enchiridion* in the patristic and byzantine period could not be taken into account. Thirdly, the many lemmata on later Greek philosophers contemporary with the fathers, especially in the Neoplatonist school, such as Elias, Hierocles Himerius, Iamblichus, Isidore of Alexandria and Julian, supply a gold-mine of accurate and up-to-date information. We should also mention the importance of the index of book titles, which allows the quick identification of books on particular subjects. The placement of the numbers of the lemmata in the headings now allows an easier use of the indices. It is a pity, however, that this volume—in contrast to the previous two—does not contain any pictures of the iconographical evidence. For example, a photograph of the famous statue of Hippolytus would have certainly been a valuable addition to the lemma.

We congratulate the editor on his achievement, and wish him all the energy and perseverance that he needs in order to continue and ultimately complete his enormously valuable project.

University of Leiden DAVID T. RUNIA

Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes. Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*, The Transformation of Classical Heritage XXX, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2000 (University of California Press), xiii + 232 pp., ISBN 0-520-22205-9, $40.00.

This is not an ordinary book about pilgrimages and pilgrims in Late Antiquity. In fact it is hardly about actual pilgrims and their journeys. It is also not a book about *loca sancta* in the Holy Land and elsewhere. This is a book about the sensual experiences pilgrims had or may have had when visiting holy places and living saints—monks, hermits, holy men—in the deserts of Egypt. In the fourth and fifth centuries visits to these holy men were an integral part of a journey to the holy sites. F. says she wrote

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

this book in order to fill the gap left behind by studies on pilgrimage that have appeared over the last decades and have deepened our knowledge about Christian pilgrimage, but which hardly discuss the matter of the pilgrim's spirituality and his or her religious sensibilities when visiting a holy man or a biblical site. The subject F. has dealt with is not an easy one. How can we know what pilgrims experienced and what they sensed when seeing a living saint or visiting a holy site? In order to answer this question, F. focuses on three aspects that were of particular importance for the spirituality of pilgrims who visited the living saints: exoticism, sensory engagement and biblical realism. By the first is meant the pilgrim's desire to become acquainted with the wonders of a distant land. The second aspect refers to the physical sense of vision and the perception of the divine; the third refers to the desire to participate in moments as described in the Scriptures. F. concentrates especially on the second aspect: the "culture of visibility", already important in non-Christian Graeco-Roman culture, and the visual access to the divine, i.e., seeing the holy as a deepening religious experience. There is also attention to tactile piety, the effect of the touch of the holy, but not as extensively as for the "eyes of faith".

Central to F.'s study are two works, both from around the year 400: *The History of the Monks in Egypt* by an anonymous Jerusalem monk, and Palladius' *Lausiac History*. These writings have almost exclusively been considered to be tales of monks and historical chronicles. However, F. prefers to see them as travelogues and as literary creations, which combined for example ancient (exotic) travel writing, saint's lives, and Bible stories; by way of their specific character they were helpful in shaping the pilgrims' perception of holy people.

After a comprehensive introductory chapter in which she puts her study into perspective and context, F. proceeds with a chapter on the above-mentioned *historiai* as travel writing. Their descriptions of miraculous and faraway regions where the saints lived and the exoticizing of the desert served to create a sense of religious displacement that made it possible for the readers of these texts to perceive and visualize monastics and saints in a spiritual way. The following chapter deals with the matter of how literary constructions like the *historiai* and other pilgrims' writings that allured pilgrims to visit holy men in the desert at the same time also shaped their perception of these holy men and functioned as a template for pilgrims to follow. In this context three common themes are discussed: the longing for face-to-face contact with the divine, the description of the desert as paradise, and the journeys of holy persons to see persons even holier than themselves. Chapters 4 and 5 are the central, most interesting and best parts of the book. Chapter 4 deals with the subject of visuality and what it meant for pilgrims to behold a holy place. By presenting a range of

examples F. makes convincingly clear how essential sight and touch of holy places and objects were for pilgrims and how these actions enabled them to enliven and experience the biblical past. Interestingly enough, this idea of sense experience was not something new for Christians but went back to earlier philosophical ideas of vision and tactile contact, especially with regard to the conception of memory. Chapter 5 "How to Read a Face" is the best, clearest in terms of argument and most successful of the book. By drawing upon the ancient ideas of the relationship between physiognomy and character, F. explains how pilgrims visualized the faces of holy men (and women) and how important for their spiritual experience of the divine it was for pilgrims to actually see the face of a saint. The old, bearded faces with sunken eyes were a living demonstration of the ascetic ideal. In these faces pilgrims could see biblical figures, like the patriarch Abraham and the prophet Moses, or angels. Through this visual experience of seeing the face of the desert saints, pilgrims were able to participate in the biblical past and deepen their spirituality; actually beholding saints' faces brought the believers closer to God. In the last chapter F. discusses briefly the experience of visualizing with regard to the Eucharist and relics. When seeing a splinter of the Cross with the eyes of faith, a believer was able to imagine the Passion and participate in it in his mind. The same is true when seeing images of the divine; F. therefore sees a continuity from the visual piety as experienced by late antique believers when seeing living saints and the cult of the icons in Byzantine times. In fact she puts forward the interesting idea that the cult of the icons was the fullest expression of the sensory piety of vision.

F.'s study does not make for easy reading. The subject is of course not an easy one, but one at times gets the impression that F. does not want to leave anything unmentioned and wants to include everything she has read (half-page footnotes are no exception). As a result it is not always facile to follow her argument; it is therefore a pity that the book does not have a clear conclusion. On the other hand, this is a study rich with ideas and one that certainly helps us to get a better idea of the sensory experiences pilgrims had when seeing the faces of living saints. It is therefore an important contribution to our understanding of late antique Christianity.

National Humanities Center
P.O. Box 12256
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709-2256, USA

Jan Willem Drijvers

THE TRUE MYSTERIES

SACRAMENTALISM IN THE *GOSPEL OF PHILIP*[1]

BY

APRIL D. DECONICK

Previous scholars of *Philip* have identified the sacraments (which they have understood to be ritual activities) as a particularly troublesome puzzle. Thus ritual in *Philip* has been the subject of numerous important and intriguing academic studies over the last generation. Each of these studies has helped steadily advance our understanding of the subject, clarifying many of the problems connected with interpreting the *Gospel of Philip*.[2]

---

[1] A rough draft of this paper was presented in 1998 to the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group at the annual meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature. It appeared in draft form in the *SBL Seminar Papers*, Part 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 483-523 under the title, "Entering God's Presence: Sacramentalism in the Gospel of Philip." I would especially like to thank my respondents, Elaine Pagels and Charles Gieschen, for their comments and criticisms on that draft as well as the members of the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group. In addition, my gratitude is extended to Gilles Quispel and Rachel Elior for reading earlier drafts of this article and providing me with their helpful comments.

[2] The major works include: H.M. Schencke, "'Das Evangelium nach Philippus'. Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag Hammadi", *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 84 (1959) 1-26; E. Segelberg, "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental System", *Numen* 7 (1960) 189-200; *idem*, "The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag-Hammadi", *Studia Patristica* 5 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962) 117-128; R. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) 129-140; H.-G. Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippus-Evangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente* (Dissertation, Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität at Bonn, 1969); A.H.C. van Eijk, "The Gospel of Philip and Clement of Alexandria: Gnostic and Ecclesiastical Theology on the Resurrection and the Eucharist", *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971) 94-120; M.A. Williams, "Realized Eschatology in the Gospel of Philip", *Restoration Quarterly* 3 (1971) 1-17; *idem*, "Uses of Gender Imagery in Ancient Gnostic Textes", in C. Walker Bynum, S. Harrell, and P. Richman (eds.) *Gender and Religion: On the Complexity of Symbols* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986) 196-227; J.-M. Sevrin, "Les Noces Spirituelles dans l'Évangile selon Philippe", *Le Muséon* 87 (1974) 143-193; *idem*, "Les Rites et la Gnose, d'après quelques Textes Gnostiques Coptes", in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et Monde Hellenistique* (Louvain-La-Neuve: Universite Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste, 1982) 440-450; J.E. Ménard, "'L'Evangile selon Philippe' et 'L'Exégèse de l'Âme'", J.E. Ménard (ed.) *Les Textes de*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Yet, despite this extraordinary effort, several issues need more discussion since we have yet to come to a consensus on the number of sacraments in *Philip* let alone a "sacramental theology." Given this situation, some scholars suggest that the style of *Philip* is so allusive that we can not understand the individual actions of the specific sacraments.[3] This line of reasoning is supported in the recent article by E. Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, and is further evidence that scholars are still struggling to reconstruct the ritual activity alluded to in this enigmatic gospel.[4] In face of this impasse, I propose that the ritual activity in *Philip* and its sacramental theology can be reconstructed by seeing these traditions as reflective of similar traditions developing simul-

---

Nag Hammadi (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975) 56-67; J.J. Buckley, "A Cult-Mystery in the Gospel of Philip", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980) 569-581; *idem*, "'The Holy Spirit is a Double Name': Holy Spirit, Mary, and Sophia in the *Gospel of Philip*", in K. King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 211-227; *idem*, "Conceptual Models and Polemical Issues in the Gospel of Philip", in W. Haase and H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II, 25.5, 4186-4190; D.H. Tripp, "The 'Sacramental System' of the Gospel of Philip", in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* 17, part 1 (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982) 251-260; K. Rudolph, "Response to 'The Holy Spirit is a Double Name': Holy Spirit, Mary, and Sophia in the '*Gospel of Philip*' by Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley", in K. King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 228-238; E. Pagels, "Adam and Eve, Christ and the Church: A Survey of Second Century Controversies Concerning Marriage," in A.H.B. Logan and A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. Wilson* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clarke, 1983) 146-175; *idem*, "The 'Mystery of Marriage' in the *Gospel of Philip* Revisited", in B.A. Pearson, *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 442-454; *idem*, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", in J.D. Turner and A. McGuire (eds.), *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years, Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*, NHMS 44 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997) 280-291; M.A. McPherson Oliver, "*The Gospel of Philip* and Early Conjugal Christianity", paper delivered at Nag Hammadi Seminar, Haverford College, November 17, 1995; J. Buckley and D.J. Good, "Sacramental Language and Verbs of Generating, Creating and Begetting in the Gospel of Philip," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997) 1-19.

Summaries of ritual activity in *Philip* also can be found in the several commentaries on this gospel: R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (New York and Evanston: Harper&Row, 1962); J.-E. Ménard, *L'Évangile selon Philippe. Introduction, texte, traduction, commentaire* (Paris: Letouzy & Ane, 1967); W.W. Isenberg, "The Coptic Gospel According to Philip" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1968); "Introduction", in B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1), and P.Oxy. 1, 654, 655, Nag Hammadi Studies* 20, v. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 131-139; H.-M. Schenke, *Gospel of Philip. German & Coptic. Das Philippus-Evangelium (Nag-Hammadi-Codex II,3)* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997).

[3] See especially, Williams, "Realized Eschatology", 1-17; Sevrin, "Les Noces Spirituelles", 143-193.

[4] Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 280-291.

taneously in early Jewish mystical circles, circles which were advocating mystical ascent through the heavenly Temple and a transforming vision of God.[5]

According to the pioneering research of R. Elior, in the aftermath of the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E., Jews within these mystical circles were perpetuating Temple worship by fostering the idea of a surrogate heavenly Temple. This idea was developed largely from the visions of Ezekiel which were preserved following the destruction of the first Temple. Refusing to accept the end of their religious worship in the wake of the destruction of their cult center, they focused on the notion of a spiritual world whose cultic practices now operated on a mystical-ritual praxis. The structure of the earthly Temple was projected into the heavens as a series of three or seven *hekhalot* or shrines, *merkavot* or chariots, *devirim* or Holy of Holies.[6] The priestly and levitical traditions of Temple worship were elevated and transferred to these supernal regions in the form of angelic duties and liturgical practices. The priestly ritual was understood to be performed by the angels in the heavenly sanctuary. As the primary liturgical performers, the angels were responsible for the ceremonies associated with the priestly blessing, the use of Divine Names, the pronunication of the unutterable Name of God, the recitation of prayers, and the performance of music.[7]

The Jewish mystic could now ascend through the various *hekhalot* or shrines in order to journey to the inner sanctum and worship before God's

---

[5] Early Jewish mysticism is an esoteric tendency within Second Temple Judaism which was characterized by speculation about ascending into heaven and gaining a transforming vision of the manifestation of God. Evidence for this tendency can be seen mainly in the Philonic corpus, Jewish apocalyptic literature, the Qumran manuscripts, and the Hekhalot texts. For a fuller discussion, refer to A.D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 33 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996) 28-37; *idem, Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and other Ancient Christian Literature*, JSNTS 157 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) especially 47-61.

[6] Cf. the three heavens, see C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1-12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources", *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993) 203-205. These are replaced by a seven-tier system. On this, refer to A.Y. Collins, "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses," in J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy and Other Worldly Journeys* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995) 62-87.

[7] See R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and its Relation to Temple Traditions", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 4 (1997) 217-267. Cf. J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Salzburg: Mueller, 1964) 133-135; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Atlanta, 1985); *idem*, "'He Has Established for Himself Priests'", in L. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 114-115.

throne.[8] He could enter the *devir*, the Holy of Holies, and gaze on God's manifestation enthroned upon the *merkavah*, the seat consisting of two cherubim with wings spread over the *kapporet*, the lid of the Ark of the Covenant (1 Chron 28:183; cf. 1 Kings 6:23-28, 8:6-7; 2 Chron 3:10-1, 5:7-8). For the human practitioner, this journey was understood to be a transformative experience. This transformation generally was described in terms of the human's transfiguration into an angel, his participation in the heavenly liturgy, or his own enthronement.[9] Often the transfiguration involved the revelation of secret knowledge about the world's operation.[10]

In the *Gospel of Philip*, we are faced with a series of three Temple shrines rather than seven: the Holy shrine, the Holy of the Holy shrine, and the Holy of the Holies shrine:

> There are three shrines (ⲏⲉⲓ)[11] for sacrifice in Jerusalem. The one opening to the west was called "the holy" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). Another opening to the south was called "the holy of the holy" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). The third open-

---

[8] The general concept of ascent has been the subject of several works: W. Bousset, "Die Himmelsreise der Seele", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 4* Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901) 136-169, 229-273; G. Widengren, *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 7 (Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln, 1950); C. Colpe, "Die 'Himmelsreise der Seele' ausserhalb und innerhalb der Gnosis," in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966, Numen Supplements* 12; (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967) 429-447; A. Segal, "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and their Environment", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.23.2 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1980) 1333-1394; U. Mann, "Geisthöhe und Seelentiefe: Die vertikale Achse der numinosen Bereiche", *Eranos* 50 (1981) 1-50; M. Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and the Beginning of Christianity", *Eranos* 50 (1981) 403-429; I.P. Culianu, "L' 'Ascension de l'âme' dans les mystères et hors des mystères," in U. Bianchi and M.J. Vermaseren (eds.), *La Soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982) 276-302; *idem, Psychanodia I: A Survey of the Evidence Concerning the Ascension of the Soul and Its Relevance* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983); *idem, Expériences de l'Extase* (Paris: Payot, 1984); M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1984); J.D. Tabor, *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Paradise in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts*, (Lanham: University Press of America, 1986); M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[9] For the idea of transformation, see C. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkavah Tradition", *Journal for Jewish Studies* 48 (1992) 1-31. For a ground-breaking discussion of participation in angelic liturgy, see Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines". Refer also to the earlier work by Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 29-71. For the theme of enthronement, see E. Wolfson, "Yeridah la-Merkavah: Typology of Ecstasy and Enthronement in Ancient Jewish Mysticism, in R.A. Herrera (ed.), *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics and Typologies* (New York: Peter Lang) 13-45.

[10] I. Gruenwald, "Knowledge and Vision: Towards a Clarification of Two 'Gnostic' Concepts in the Light of Their Alleged Origins", *Israel Oriental Studies* 3 (1973) 63-107.

[11] I translate ⲏⲉⲓ as "shrine" because this translation captures its meaning within this

ing to the east was called "the holy of the holies" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ), the place where only the high priest enters (69:15-21).

Philip associates these shrines with particular "sacraments:" "Baptism is 'the holy' shrine. Redemption is 'holy of the holy'. 'The holy of the holies' is the bridal chamber" (ⲡⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲏⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ [ⲡ]ⲥⲱ[ⲧ]ⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉⲧ[ⲟⲩⲁ]ⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ) (69:22-25).[12] Also in 67:28-30 we find a passage which identifies the "sacraments" as baptism, chrism, eucharist, redemption, and bridal chamber: "The Lord [did] everything in a mystery: a baptism and a chrism, a eucharist and a redemption, and a bridal chamber" (ⲁⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ [ⲥ ⲡ̄] ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲃⲁ[ⲡ]ⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣ[ⲓⲥⲧ]ⲓⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ).[13]

Clearly baptism, chrism, and the eucharist are ritual activities. But what about "redemption" and "bridal chamber?" Does ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ, or "sacrament," have to indicate a *ritual* sacrament as Segelberg and others after him have assumed? Or can it be more inclusive, describing an experience in which the human does not participate alone, but where he acts in communion with God? In a "sacrament," the human participates in a higher reality, the reality of the Spirit without ever ceasing to be human. Long ago, the Church Father John Chrysostom explained that a "sacrament" had a double meaning: "what we believe is not the same as what we see, but we see one thing and believe another."[14] The distinctive feature of a sacrament is that it is at once both "visible and invisible."[15] It is a combination of "an outward visible sign with an inward spiritual grace."[16] They

---

context better than "building" as W.W. Isenberg renders in the critical edition edited by B. Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codes II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655, Nag Hammadi Studies* 20, v. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 180-181. The Coptic ⲏⲉⲓ is associated with σκηνή (temple or house), οἶκος (temple or house of god), οἴκημα (chamber, temple, or chapel), μυχός (the innermost room), and δίαιτα (room). On this refer to Crum, 66a. Cf. R. Cameron, "Ancient Myths and Modern Theories of the Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins," *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 11 (1999) p. 242.

[12] Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*, 180.

[13] Punctuation is my own. For text and translation, see Layton and Isenberg, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*, 176-177. In this passage, I understand swte to refer to the redeeming power of the rituals, available through participation in the Eucharist in particular, and realized or actualized in the eschatological Bridal Chamber. Thus it is not a separate ritual. Other passages in *Philip* seem to support this interpretation: 62:14, 69:23; 69:26; cf. 53:2; 53:14; 71:2-3; 85:29.

[14] *Homilies on 1 Corinthians*, 7.1 (*P.G.* 61.55).

[15] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church: New Edition* (New York: Penguin, 1993) 274.

[16] Ware, *Orthodox*, 274.

are the means by which "God's grace is approriated to every Christian *individually*."[17] Today, according to Meyendorff, "a sacrament is a 'passage' to true life; it is man's [humanity's!] salvation."[18] A sacrament is an "*eternal* Mystery where the boundaries between heaven and earth are broken and where human decision and action acquire an eternal dimension."[19]

If we allow for this broader definition of ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ in *Philip*, then "redemption" and the "bridal chamber" might not be actual rituals, but instead holy "mysteries" which, in some way, allow the human to connect to the divine source of life. Therefore, the sacraments should be understood to include manners of thinking sacrally, mundane activities infused with sacrosanct meanings, as well as ritual performances. *Philip's* sacraments seem to have this double entrendre: a worldly meaning which is "deceptive" and an eternal meaning which is "correct" (53:24-35). Thus, I contend that it is necessary to let ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ function in this broader sense rather than the narrowly confined understanding that has permeated previous scholarship. If we allow for this broader definition, I believe that the complicated passages which refer to baptism, chrism, eucharist, redemption, bridal chamber, and marriage in *Philip* become much more sensible.

In this paper, therefore, I propose a new paradigm for interpreting the sacraments in *Philip*, a paradigm grounded in the broader definition of "sacrament." So I understand "sacraments" or the "true mysteries" to include more than ritual activities; they also identify those human thoughts and actions which have been invested with sacral meaning.

In addition, I hope to demonstrate that just as the Jewish mystics invented a surrogate supernal Temple of seven shrines through which they could ascend to the Presence of God and perform their liturgical duties, the *Gospel of Philip* preserves a similar celestial Temple tradition. Its three heavenly Temple shrines represent the esoteric reality behind the sacraments. It is plausible that these sacraments are understood on the spiritual level to represent the three rooms of the previously destroyed Temple: the *ulam* or vestibule; the *hekhal* or cental room; and the *devir* or inner sanctum. Just as each of these rooms represents a greater degree of holiness within the Temple,[20] so does each sacrament in *Philip*. Each stage in the ascent through

---

[17] Ware, *Orthodox*, 276.

[18] J. Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984) 20.

[19] Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 23.

[20] M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

the rooms of the heavenly Temple brings the believer closer to the *devir*, the Holy of Holies where the Presence of God dwells, seated upon his *merkavah*. As the believer moves through each Temple shrine, he is progressively transformed. For the Christian Gnostic, this ascent culminates in an eschatological experience at the much-anticipated End, when the believer finally is able to enter the Holy of Holies and gaze upon the Father, fully transformed.

1) *The Initiatory Sacramental Rituals*

The initiatory stage in the mystical-sacramental praxis is a ritual performance stage. Since this stage is the first of the three Holy shrines, it plausibly can be associated with the *ulam* or vestibule of the Temple in Jerusalem. It is quite noteworthy that before the priests were permitted to enter the Temple, they had to ritually immerse themselves (cf. Mishnah, *Tamid* 1:2, 4; 2:1; cf. *Yoma* 3:3). This immersion took place in the "sea of bronze" (1 Kg 7:23-26), a great water container supported by twelve statues of bulls (2 Chron 4:6). This basin was located to the south of the altar just outside the *ulam*.[21] This aspect is transferred to the angels in the *Hekhalot* literature where they too must bath and purify themselves in order to carry out their liturgical functions in the heavenly Temple.[22]

In *Philip*, the two initiatory rituals are performed at the same time: baptism by water and baptism by fire, which is unction or chrism (cf. 57:23-29; 67:3-9; 69:5-15). These rituals are performed for purification purposes. Baptism by water and fire operate on two levels, purifying the "visible" or physical aspect and the "hidden" or spiritual aspect: "It is through water and fire that the whole place is purified—the visible by visible, the hidden by hidden" (ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲉⲩⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲁ̄ⲡⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ϩⲓⲡⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ) (57:23-25). *Philip* explains that the water and oil work to consecrate the soul and the spirit: "It is from water and fire that the soul and spirit came into being . . . the fire is the chrism" (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̣ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲧⲯⲩⲭ̣[ⲏ] ⲙⲛ̄

---

[21] R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (translated by J. McHugh; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961) 319-320; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (translated by D. Green; London: S.P.C.K., 1966) 161; F.J. Murphy, *The Religious World of Jesus* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991) 77.

[22] Cf. P. Shäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen, 1981) paragraphs 54, 181, 184-185, 811, 814-816, 916. For discussion, refer to Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines".

ⲡⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲯⲱⲡⲉ . . . ⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ) (67.3-6). The hidden quality of the oil is that it is the holy fire of the sacred realm "whose form is white, which is bright and beautiful, and which gives beauty" (ⲡⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ <ⲧⲉ>ⲭⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ ⲟⲩⲁⲃⲯ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧϯ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲥⲁ) (67:7-9).

I suggest that the hidden quality of the oil functions to consecrate the person so that he may enter the fiery realm of heaven. It is a well-documented part of heavenly geography that a river of fire flows near the throne of the Glory.[23] The angels in Jewish texts purify themselves in the river of fire in order to prepare themselves to join in the heavenly Temple liturgy (*3 Enoch* 36; Schäfer, section 920). It appears that this heavenly geography was embedded deeply in the Valentinian tradition since it shows up in the *Extracts of Theodotus*[24] as well. In this text, there is a river of fire that runs beneath the throne. Moreover, the whole space of the Holy of Holies is fire. The veil conceals the fiery depths of the Holy of Holies from view so that no one is "destroyed by the sight of it" (Διὰ τοῦτο . . . καταπέτασμα ἔχει, ἵνα μὴ ἐκ τῆς προσόψεως ἀναλωθῇ τὰ πνεύματα). Only the archangel, the High Priest, enters the Holy of Holies. This is Jesus who was called in and enthroned. He will provide passage for the saved seed into the Pleroma only at the End (38:1-3).

The connection between the initiatory rituals and immersion in the fire of heaven may have developed in response to the fact that some traditions remembered Jesus' own baptism as an event bringing with it heavenly fire. Justin Martyr, for instance, tells Trypho that the Jordan River was blazing with fire when Jesus entered the water (πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ). When he came out of the water, he received the Holy Spirit (*Dialogue with Trypho* 88).[25] In two old Latin recensions of Matthew 3:15, there is mention that a great light shone out of the water at the moment of Jesus' baptism (It^{a}: *et cum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua*; Vg^{ms}: *et cum baptizaretur Iesus, lumen magnum fulgebat de aqua*). According to Ephrem's *Commentary on the Diatessaron* 4.5, there was "the shining of the light upon the waters". The combined evidence has caused W.L. Petersen to con-

---

[23] For a complete list of references, refer to H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928) 60 n. 19, 112 n. 4.

[24] For critical edition, see F. Sagnard, *Les Extraits de Théodote, Sources Chrétiennes* 23 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1948).

[25] Epiphanius records that after the voice spoke from heaven, "immediately a great light shone around the place" (εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα) *Panarion* 30.13.7.

clude that this tradition is very old and was either forgotten or rejected by later Christians.[26]

In addition to their consecrating power, the initiatory rituals in *Philip* are understood to be a new birth for the believer, begetting him "through Christ in the two [*i.e.*, baptism and chrism]" (ϩITN̄ ΠΕΧC̄ ϩM̄ ΠCNAY) (69:5-7; cf. 67:13-20). This emphasis on rebirth is also highlighted in the Valentinian *Extracts of Theodotus* 78:1-2 where baptism liberates one from Fate, bringing about rebirth. This rebirth probably mirrors the spiritual birth of the aeon Jesus who had been conceived through the union of the Virgin or Holy Spirit and the Father in the Pleromic bridal chamber (*Gos.Phil.* 55:24-29; 71:4-11), since the text indicates that "we are indeed reborn through the Holy Spirit" (ЄBOλ ϩITM̄ ΠNA̅ ЄTOYAAB CЄ ⲁΠO ΜЄN M̄MO[N] N̄KЄCOΠ) (69:5).[27]

Because the text understands baptism to be regenerative (cp. John 3:3), it should not be surprising that it takes issue with the Pauline theology that through baptism the believers undergo ritual death: "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν)? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον)" (Rom 6:3-4a).[28] In response, *Philip* explains that "by perfecting the water of baptism, Jesus emptied it of death. Thus we go down into the water, but we do not go down into death" (N̄ΘЄ N̄TA ĪC̄ ⲁωK ЄBOλ M̄ΠMOOY M̄ΠBAΠTICMA TAЄI TЄ ΘЄ AϥΠωϩT ЄBOλ M̄ΠMOY ЄTBЄ ΠAЄI TN̄BHK ΜЄN ЄΠITN̄ ЄΠMOOY TN̄BHK ⲁЄ AN ЄΠITN̄ ЄΠMOY) (77:8-11). Rather, through the baptismal ceremonies, which included anointing with holy oil, the initiate is reborn of the Holy Spirit and then is invested with this Spirit (64:23-27).[29]

Furthermore, the investment of the Holy Spirit through the initiatory rituals is connected to the investment with the redeeming Name of God. Indeed, in *Philip* the initiate not only gains the name of Christ through

---

[26] W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 20. Cf. B.H. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[27] Concerning this notion, see now Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 285-286.

[28] Cf. Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 286-287.

[29] On the connection in early Christianity between unction and the reception of the Holy Spirit, see A.D. De Conick, "Stripped Before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas", *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991) 125-127.

chrism (74:12-25), becoming a "Christian", but he now is transformed into "a Christ" (ⲟⲩⲭ̅ⲣ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉ) (67:29). The name of Christ, of course, is the unutterable Name of the Father which he gave to Jesus (ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲙⲁⲩⲧⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁϥ ϩ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲱⲏⲣⲉ) (54:6-10). Moreover, as *Philip* indicates, Jesus "clothed himself with the Name of the Father" (ⲁϥⲧ ϩⲓⲱⲱϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ) so that he would be transformed into the Father (54:10-11). The Christians who have been invested with this Name, know the Name but do not speak it (54:11-12). It is "the Name above all things: the name of the Father" (ϥⲥⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ) (54:7). Obviously, it is the same as referred to in Philippians 2:9, τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, which is given to Jesus: κύριος the Greek substitute for the Tetragrammaton.[30]

The investiture of the Valentinian Christian with the unutterable Name of God may have been in imitation of Jesus' own baptism and investiture with the Name since the Valentinians taught that the descent of the spirit or dove (cf. Mark 1:10) is associated with the investiture of the Name of God (cf. *Extracts of Theodotus* 22:5-6).[31] Thus, through the initiatory rituals, the believer imitates Jesus' investment with the Name at his own baptism in the Jordan.

Irenaeus alludes to this connection in his statement about the investment of the Name upon the Valentinians: "the Name which is hidden (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον) from every deity, dominion, and power, which Jesus the Nazarene donned (ὃ ἐνεδύσατο) in the spheres of light, [the Name] of Christ" (*Adv. haer.* I.21.3). Notice, according to Irenaeus, that Jesus puts on the Name in the "spheres of light". This must denote investiture within the heavenly realm perhaps representing the supernal hidden reality behind Jesus' external baptism.

Such an allusion makes me speculate whether Jesus' investiture and that of the Valentinians as newly born Christians, should be understood within the context of priestly investiture in the heavenly Temple. This becomes plausible when we recall that in the *Gospel of Philip*, Jesus is associated with the "high priest" who will be able to enter the Holy of Holies of the heavenly Temple, bringing with him the Saved, those of the "order of the priesthood" (ⲉⲣⲱⲁ ϩ̅ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ϩ̅ⲛ̅ ⲧⲫⲩϫⲏ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ

[30] Refer to J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 36 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 95-106.

[31] G. Quispel, "Gnosticism and the New Testament", *Gnostic Studies* I (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1974) 208.

ⲛⲁⲯⲥⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ) (85:1-5).

According to Exodus 29, the consecration ceremony for the priest began by first washing him at the entrance to the Tent. Then the priest was to be invested with the priestly garb which included the turban. There is evidence that the turban was decorated with the Name of God (cf. Philo, *De vita Mos.* 2.114, 132; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.331). Furthermore, his head was anointed with oil. After these ceremonies, he could enter the holy place and perform his liturgical functions.

Similarly, the priest must be consecrated in heaven once the Temple was projected into the supernal realm in the esoteric Jewish traditions. We find a clear example of this in the *Testament of Levi* where Levi journeys through heaven in a vision. He calls the uppermost heaven the Holy of Holies in which the great Glory is enthroned (3:4; 5:1-2). The gates of the heavenly Temple are opened and he sees the Glory within. Then God gives him the blessing of the priesthood (5:1-2). Later, Levi is washed, anointed, clothed in the priestly garments and fed bread and wine (8). In the Aramaic manuscript, the angels say, "Now, see how we elevated you above all and how we gave you the anointing of eternal peace".[32]

Comparably, in *2 Enoch*, the hero Enoch ascends to the seventh heaven where God is enthroned and the angels perform the liturgy before him. Michael removes Enoch's earthly garments, anoints him with good oil, and clothes him in glorious garb (22:8). The oil is described as "greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun" (22:9-10). He is transformed into an angel (22:10-11). It is clear that this investiture and transformation is of a priestly nature, since the discussion of Enoch's progeny toward the closing of *2 Enoch* understands them to be of priestly descent (cf. *2 Enoch* 68-73).

It should be noted that the association of baptism and chrism with the priesthood and admittance to the heavenly Temple is not unknown in other early Christian literature. For instance, in the Christian-Jewish text, the *Pseudo-Clementina*, chrism is directly connected to the consecration of Aaron. It is stated that when Jesus became man, God anointed him with oil which was taken from "the wood of the tree of life." Because of this,

---

[32] H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985) 461.

Jesus is called "Christ." Moreover, Jesus now "anoints with similiar oil every one of the pious when they come to his Kingdom, for their refreshment after their labors, having overcome the difficulties of the way; so that their light may shine, and being filled with the Holy Spirit, they may be endowed with immortality" (*Recognitions* I.XLX). The author goes on to state that Aaron, the first High priest, "was anointed with a composition of chrism, which was made after the pattern of that spiritual ointment of which we have mentioned previously" (*Recognitions* I.XLVI).

This cluster of ideas must be connected to the early tradition embedded in 1 Peter 2 where the Christians are described as "being built into a spiritual house, into a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (2:5). They are "the chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people acquired" (γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν) which has been called out of darkness into "his marvelous light' (2:9). This transformation into a Christian priesthood, according to 1 Peter, is the result of having been "born anew (ἀναγεγεννημένοι) not of perishable but of imperishable seed" (1:23). Certainly this language is reminiscent of the initiatory rituals as interpreted by *Philip*.[33]

We might note, as well, the reference in Hebrews 10:19-22 which states that Christians can enter the heavenly Temple with confidence because their hearts have been "sprinkled" clean and their "bodies washed with pure water" (λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ). Similiarly, we find a reference to the spiritual Temple in the *Epistle of Barnabas* where the author expresses his concerns about the destruction of the earthly Temple and the rebuilding of the "incorruptible" Temple. The incorruptible Temple will be built "in the name of the Lord" and "in glory." How? The author explains:

> Having received the forgiveness of sins and having placed our trust in the name of the Lord, we have become new creatures, formed again from the beginning . . . [God has] opened the doors of the Temple to us who were

[33] The notion that Jesus' own baptism in the Jordan transferred him to the priesthood serves as the basis of Christian baptism in the Syrian tradition rather than the Pauline idea of dying and rising with Christ. On this, see S.P. Brock, "The Syrian Baptismal Ordines", *Studia Liturgica* 12 (1977) 177-183. Cf. *Didascalia* 16: "As of old the priests and kings were anointed in Israel, do thou in like manner, with the imposition of the hand, anoint the head of those who receive baptism . . ."

> enslaved by death . . . By giving us repentance, [God has] introduced us into the incorruptible Temple (16).

Since the phrase, "having received the forgiveness of sins," probably indicates baptism, while "having placed our trust in the name of the Lord" must allude to chrism, we find that this text preserves a similar interpretation of these rituals: they open the doors of the spiritual Temple and allow the initiate to enter as "new creatures," bearing the image of God which was given to the human in the beginning.

It seems that *Philip* is aware of this trajectory of Christian interpretation of baptism and chrism. This gospel further develops this understanding by connecting the initiatory rituals with the language of life and resurrection. The initiate rises from the water and is anointed into the "resurrection" as *Philip* states: "it is from the olive tree that we get the chrism, and from the chrism, the resurrection" (ⲧⲃⲉⲛ̄ϫⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲙⲁ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲧⲏⲥ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ) (73:17-19). In the same passage, *Philip* associates the oil from the olive tree with the Tree of Life in the garden of Eden (73:15-17). *Philip* stresses this connection, rebuking those who think otherwise: "Those who say they will die first and then rise are in error. If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing" (ⲛⲉⲧϫ̣ⲱ ⲙ̣̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛ̣ⲁ̣ⲧ̣ⲱⲟⲩⲛ [ⲛ̄] ⲥⲉⲣ̄ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁⲥⲑⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲙ̄ϫⲓ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ) (73:1-5). Just as Christ was resurrected, so too the initiated are resurrected through chrism (56:15-20). They are assured that upon their deaths, when they "strip off the flesh", they will enter "rest" because they have acquired "the resurrection" while in this world (ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲛϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϣϣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉϫⲡⲟ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲛϣⲁⲕⲁⲁⲕⲛ ⲁϩⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲉⲥⲟⲧⲏⲥ) (66:16-20; cf. 67:13-16).

Acquiring rebirth, the Name of God, and resurrection through the baptismal and anointing ceremonies is the beginning of the initiate's tranformative experiences. *Philip* explains this initial transformation by using the analogy of God as a professional "dyer". The dyes both purify and immortalize. This purifying effect is expressed in one of *Philip's* stories: "The Lord went into the dye works of Levi. He took seventy-two different colors and threw them into the vat. He took them out all white. And he said, 'Even so has the Son of Man come [as] a dyer'" (63:25-30). Immersion also infuses the initiate with immortality. Just as good dyes "dissolve with the things dyed in them, so it is with those whom God has dyed. Since his

dyes are immortal, they become immortal by means of his colors" (ϵⲡϵⲓⲁⲏ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ⲛϵ ⲛϵϥⲁⲱⲥϵ ⲯⲁⲩⲣ̄ ⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ϵⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲛϵϥⲡⲁϩⲣϵ) (61:13-19). So "God baptises what he baptises in water" (ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ ⲁϵ ⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ⲛ̄ⲛϵⲧϥⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ) (61.20).

Lastly, *Philip* associates the initiatory rituals with a particular visionary experience. This association is made in 69:5-14 where it is stated that through baptism and chrism the initiate is not only begotten by the Holy Spirit and Christ, but he is joined (ϩⲱⲧⲣ) to them. This union is necessary in order for the person to gain the ability to "see" in the "light". "For this reason, it is fitting to baptize in the two, in the light [which is chrism] and the water" (ⲁⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ ⲯⲯⲉ ⲁⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁϵ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ).

For *Philip* such a visionary encounter is nothing less than transformative. This belief in the transformative power of vision rests upon the ancient belief that the image enters the seer through the eye and becomes part of his soul. As we find in Achilles Tatius, *Clitophon and Leucippe*: "The pleasure which comes from vision enters by the eyes and makes its home in the breast; bearing with it ever the image . . . it impresses it upon the mirror of the soul and leaves there its image" (5:13).[34] *Philip* teaches the newly initiated about this awesome transforming power of their visionary experience: "It is not possible for anyone to see anything of the things that actually exist unless he becomes like them (ⲙⲛ̄[ⲟⲩ]ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲗⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲉⲓ ⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ) . . . You saw something of that place, and you became those things. You saw the Spirit, you became the Spirit" (ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲕⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲁⲕⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ) (61:20-23, 28-30).

Thus the baptismal and anointing ceremonies, according to *Philip*, first cleanse the initiate, allowing him access into the first of the three heavenly Temple chambers. Moreover, through this ceremony he is ritually reborn of the Holy Spirit, receiving the Name and the resurrection. As a consecrated priest and a child of the resurrection, he mystically enters the first of the sacred shrines and encounters the Holy Spirit face to face.

It is fascinating to find that this understanding of the initiatory rituals is confirmed by another Valentinian text from Nag Hammadi, the *Valentinian Exposition*. We find in this text, fragments which describe both baptism and

---

[34] I am grateful to Andrea Lieber for bringing this text to my attention.

chrism. Baptism in the water or the Jordan is for the "forgiveness of sins" which brings the human into "imperishability." When the initiate enters the Jordan, he descends into imperishability, being "[sent] out [of the world] into the Aeon." Furthermore, the descent into the Jordan is really "[the upward progression], that [is, our Exodus] from the world [into] the Aeon" (41:24-38). Another fragment relates that the descent into the Jordan is the ascent from the "[blindness] of the world [into the sight of] God." In addition, it is the ascent from the carnal into the "spiritual," from the physical state to the "angelic," from the created kosmos to the eternal Pleroma or Aeon, from slavery to "sonship." Thus, the text concludes, through baptism "we were brought [from] seminal [bodies into bodies] with a perfect form . . . And [Christ brought] us forth who are [in him, and] from now on the souls [will become] perfect spirits" (42:10-37). The next section of this paper will explore how this transformation into "perfect spirits" was believed to be fully accomplished.

2) *The Eucharist Sacrament*

The eucharist sacrament is another ritual activity referred to by *Philip*. It seems to correspond to the Holy of the Holy shrine, the shrine closely tied to "redemption" (69:23). Accordingly, this shrine is to be associated with the second room in the Temple, the *hekhal* or holy place. In the *hekhal* stood a golden altar for incense offerings (1 Kg 7:48; cf. 1 Kg 6:20-21), ten lampstands (1 Kg 7:48-49), *shulchan ha-panim* or the table of the Countenance (1 Kg 7:48-49) upon which was ritually offered *lechem ha-panim*, the bread of the Countenance. Every Sabbath twelve loaves of unleavened bread were placed on the table before the face of Yahweh (Lev 24:5-9). After a week, the loaves were eaten by the priests (Lev 6:7-9; 24:5-9).[35] There seems also to be evidence that the priests placed jugs of wine on the Table along with the loaves and then partook of beverage and bread when the time came for them to participate in the weekly meal.[36]

Andrea Lieber, in her research on feasting language and visions in Jewish mysticism, has sparked renewed interest in the cult meal and its ritual context. The holy meal seems to have represented some type of sacrifice to Yahweh. This is supported not only by Ezekiel who compares the table

---

[35] de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 319; Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 160.
[36] Haran, 216-217.

with an altar (Ezek 41:21-22), but also by Leviticus 24:5-9 where the eating of the bread by the priests is equated with the most holy offering to God. As such it was a meal offered to God (Lev 3:11, 16) and one which the priests eventually shared (Lev 24:5-9). It is plausible that, since both God and the priests partook of the bread, this sacrifice can be understood as effecting some sort of communion between Yahweh and Israel, perhaps affirming kinship between the deity and the human community. Further, the priests seem to have assimilated the sacred aspect of the bread by consuming the loaves in God's presence. By imbibing sacred bread, they incorporated the sacred within their bodies (Lev 6:7-9).[37]

According to *Philip*, the second shrine is the eucharist and "the eucharist is Jesus (ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅) . . . 'the one spread out', for Jesus came to crucifiy the world" (63:21-25). As we find in John, Jesus' body is understood to be bread from heaven which provides nourishment to those who eat it. Thus *Philip* exclaims: "When Christ the Perfect Man came, he brought bread from heaven in order that the human might be nourished with the food of Man" (ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲉⲓ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̅ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲯⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲣ̅ⲧⲣⲉⲫⲉⲥⲑⲁⲓ ⲉⲛ̅ ⲧⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ) (55:11-14).

This action is associated with the crucifixion when Jesus was offered up to God in place of animal sacrifices. Unlike the previous sacrifical cult which offered up animals alive who then died, Jesus was offered up dead and then lived (55:1-5). Thus, Jesus' body is nourishing, life-giving. His body is living bread from heaven. And "to those who so desired, he gave [life, that] they might not die" (ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲯ ⲁⲩⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ [ⲛ̅ⲟⲩ]ⲱ[ⲛⲉ] ⲁⲉ[ⲕⲁⲁⲥ] ⲛ̅ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ) (73:25-27).[38] Certainly there is a connection between these ideas and the Christological title that *Philip* applies to Jesus in 85:1-5: the title High Priest.

---

[37] A.B. Lieber has developed these ideas as part of her doctoral dissertation, "God Incorporated: Feasting on the Divine Presence and the Eschatological Meal in Early Jewish Mysticism" (Columbia University, 1998). I am indebted to her for allowing me access to her unfinished manuscript. Cf. W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions* (New York: Schocken Books, 1972); J.G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy: A Treatise on Certain Early Forms of Superstition and Society*, 4 volumes (London: Macmillian, 1910); *idem, The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (New York: Macmillian, 1951); M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966); *idem, Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973); N. Jay, *Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion and Paternity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[38] Cp. Ignatius of Antioch, *Ephesians* 20:2, where the eucharistic elements are the "medicine of immortality". D.B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 179-197, discusses the Greco-Roman perception of prophylaxis.

These ideas are very old since many of them are found embedded in the text of Hebrews. There, Jesus is the High Priest who has entered the Holy of Holies and offered himself up for the sins of humanity just as the previous High Priests had offered the blood of animals for the sins of the people annually in the Temple in Jerusalem (1:3-4; 2:17; 5:8-10; 6:19-20; 7:23-28;9:1-28; 10:11-14). The Christians are told to "have confidence" to "draw near to the throne of grace" (τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος) (4:16), to let their hope enter "the inner shrine room behind the curtain where Jesus has gone as a forerunner" on their behalf as the High Priest (ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) (6:19-20). They are instructed to "offer God acceptable worship with reverence and awe; for our God is a consuming fire" (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον) (12:28-29).

How do believers enter the Temple to worship God who dwells in the fiery depths of the Holy of Holies? In Hebrews 10:19-22, we find an answer not unlike the one *Philip* offers: through the initiatory rituals and the eucharist meal: "We have confidence to enter the Temple by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh (ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ), and since we have a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water (καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ)".

The emphasis, in Hebrews, is on partaking the body and blood of Jesus as an *atoning* sacrifice whereas in *Philip* the focus is on the consumption of a divine body as a *divinizing* mechanism. Gilles Quispel makes this distinction clear in his discussion about the differences between the Roman mass and the Greek Orthodox eucharist: "In the Roman Mass, God is a tremendous majesty, who is to be atoned by the sacrifice offered to him. The aim and purpose of the Roman Mass is atonement; of the Greek eucharist, at-one-ment."[39] Quispel explains, "The Greeks venerate in their liturgy the Unknown God beyond understanding, they venerate Christ,

---

[39] G. Quispel, "The *Asclepius*: From Hermetic Lodge in Alexandria to the Greek Eucharist and the Roman Mass," in R. van den Broek and W.J. Hanegraaff (eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism: From Antiquity to Modern Times* (Albany: SUNY, 1998) 70.

who in a mysterious way sacrifices and is sacrificed and whose spirit is invoked upon the faithful and upon the elements of bread and wine in order to divinize the initiates who participate in this mystery."[40] It seems that *Philip* preserves an understanding of the eucharist very close to that of the Orthodox.

Philip associates the benefits of the eucharist with the eschatological resurrection. In 56:26-57:22, the author is involved in a debate over what kind of body we will have in the resurrection. He seems to be arguing with a group of Christians who contended that they must rise in the flesh because they could not be naked before God. *Philip* responds to this, arguing that those who would rise in the body actually will be naked. He further responds by exegeting 1 Corinthians 15, stating that instead, we must unclothe ourselves so that we can be reclothed in our spiritual bodies. He maintains that the believer who partakes in the eucharist, will already have received Jesus' "flesh" as clothing in which to arise. He summarizes:

> What is this which will not inherit? This which is on us [*i.e.*, our bodies] (ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲱⲱⲛ). But what is this, too, which will inherit? It is that which belongs to Jesus and his blood (ⲧⲁ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲟⲩ). Because of this he said, "He who shall not eat my flesh and drink my blood has not life in him" (John 6:53). What is it? His flesh is the word, and his blood is the Holy Spirit (ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). He who has received these has food and he has drink and clothing (ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲟⲩ[ⲛ]ⲧⲉⲩ ⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩ ⲥⲱ ⲣⲓ ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ⲱ) (56:33-57:9).

Philip repeatedly refers to this clothing as the "Perfect Man" (ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ), a reference to the resurrected or transformed body of Jesus. In 75:15-25, he tells us that the cup contains "wine and water", the image of Jesus' blood. This must be a reference to John 19:34 where blood and water poured out of Jesus' pierced side at the crucifixion. This cup of wine and water is "full of the Holy Spirit" (ϥⲙⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ), belonging to "the wholly Perfect Man" (ⲡⲁ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ). When the believers drink of the cup, they will receive for themselves "the Perfect Man" (ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ). Thus the "living water", the eucharistic cup, "is a body" (ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲡⲉ). Since it is necessary for the believer to "put on the living man" (ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲛ̅ⲧ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ), he must first descend into the waters of baptism, unclothing himself, so that he might now put on the Living Man through imbibing the eucharistic body.

---

[40] Quispel, "*Asclepius*," 70.

The union of the believer with the resurrected body of Jesus has a significant soteriological purpose. The transformation into the Perfect Man has the effect of cloaking the believer from the archons during ascent.[40a] This may reflect the fact that Jesus' own movement through the heavens was undetectable to the archons who populate the realms. The *Extracts of Theodotus*, for instance, mention the fact that Jesus put on the psychic Christ whose body was invisible to the archons (59:3).

So important is this eucharistic theology, that *Philip* repeats it three times in his gospel. On the first occasion, he states: "The archons do not see those who are clothed in the perfect light, and consequently are not able to detain them." He will clothe himself in this light by uniting (ϩωτ̅ρ̅) with the Perfect Man sacramentally (70:5-10). In the second instance, *Philip* associates the garment of perfect light with the body of the Perfect Man: "Not only will they be unable to detain the Perfect Man, but they will not be able to see him, for if they see him they will detain him. There is no other way for a person to aquire this grace (ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ) except by putting on the perfect light." The one who has cloaked himself in the light will enter heaven (76:23-30). In the third case, we are told that the person must receive the perfect light while on earth because "he will not be able to receive it in the other place" (ⲉⲧⲙ̅ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲓⲧⲩ ⲉⲩⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲩⲛⲁϣⲁⲓⲧⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲉⲙⲁ). He restates that the reception of the body of light provides invisibility so that the believer can not be detained during his final ascent (ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϣⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲩ). And he adds that no power will be able "to torment a person like this while he dwells in this world" (86:6-11).

These ideas seem to be the basis for a passage found in another Valentinian text, the *Interpretation of Knowledge*. In this text, believers must "receive" Jesus' "shape," probably through the eucharist meal. This "shape" "exists in the presence [of the Father]." So it seems that the resurrected body of Jesus is being described. Furthermore, the shape or resurrected body is the vehicle which will allow the believer to ascend because Jesus is bearing him upon his "shoulders." Jesus commands him, "Enter through the rib whence you came and hide yourself from the beasts" or Archons (10:24-36). Clearly the believer is understood to become part of the resurrected body of Jesus,

---

[40a] Irenaeus associates the sacrament of last rites with this cloaking effect stating that certain Valentinians anointed those who were dieing so that "their inner man may ascend on high in an invisible manner." The rite made the person "incapable of being seized or seen by the principalities and powers" (Iren., *Adv.Haer.* I.21.5).

which is also described as the body of the primordial Adam. The connection with the primordial Adam should not be surprising since the first earthly man was identified in Jewish and Christian literature with the "image and likeness of God," the heavenly Man, and the *Kavod*.[41]

Thus, for the Valentinians, to receive the resurrected body, the Perfect Man, is to have one's own body transformed into the primordial body which can be resurrected but which also will be invisible to the archons. Only if one possesses the transformed body will one be able to enter the heavenly throneroom and gaze on the Father. *Philip* explains: "Do not despise the Lamb [*i.e.*, the sacrificed body], for without it, it is not possible to see the King. No one will be able to go in to the King if he is naked" (ⲘⲠⲢⲕⲁⲧⲁⲫⲣⲟⲛⲉⲓ ⲘⲠⲉⲓⲉⲓⲃ ⲁⲍⲚⲧⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲚ ⲩⲥⲟⲙ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡ<ⲣ>ⲣⲟ ⲙⲚ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩⲧ ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲣⲣⲟ ⲉⲩⲕⲏⲕⲁⲫⲏⲩ) (58:15-17). The transformed body then is the proper covering for the ascent into the cosmic Temple and the much-anticipated vision of the Father.

Therefore, the body of the human must be transformed into the body of the Perfect Man. This occurs by incorporating the body and blood of Christ. Such ritual action has extreme consecrating and redeeming power and is to be associated with the believer's entrance into the second holy shrine of the heavenly Temple, the *hekhal*. Here, on a regular basis, just like the priests in the past, the believer approaches the table of the Presence, now the table of the eucharist, and partakes of the holy bread and wine. In so doing, he incorporates the divine body and blood of Christ into his own body. Just as the believer saw the Holy Spirit and thus became the Holy Spirit in the first shrine, *Philip* reminds the believer that here he has seen Christ and has become Christ: "It is not possible for anyone to see anything of the things that actually exist unless he becomes like them . . . You saw something of that place, and you became those things. You saw the Spirit, you became the Spirit. You saw Christ, you became Christ" (ⲁⲕⲛⲁ[ⲩ ⲁ]ⲡⲭⲥ ⲁⲕⲩⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲭⲥ) (61:20-23, 28-31).

It is noteworthy that connections between the eucharist and ascent into the heavenly Temple have been perserved in the Roman Mass and the Greek Orthodox eucharist liturgies, suggesting that *Philip* was aware of some very early Christian interpretations of this ritual. During the Roman Mass and Greek eucharist, the congregration is supposed to lift up their hearts to heaven and sing with the angels before God's throne as Isaiah

[41] Fossum, *Name*, 266-291.

heard during his throne vision (Isa 6:3), "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God." Quispel surmises that "the idea that the faithful make a heavenly journey during the Eucharist is not just simply a metaphor, but must be taken quite literally," especially in light of texts like the *Apocryphon of James* in which "the terminology of this heavenly journey ('gave thanks,' and 'we also') clearly is an allusion to the liturgy, where the hearts are lifted up during the Eucharist and man sings in harmony with the angels."[42]

3) *Marriage as a Sacrament*

Thus we approach the *devir*, the third and most holy chamber of the heavenly Temple. In the *devir*, it was believed that God's Presence dwelled. As such, his *kavod* or manifestation was enthroned upon the *merkavah* behind the veil which separates the inner sanctum from the *hekhal*. The cherubim with outstretched wings overlaid the lid of the Ark of the Covenant and formed the seat of the special throne (1 Chron 28:18; Sirarch 49:8; cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kg 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:1, 99:1).[43] The goal of the Jewish mystic was to ascend through the seven *hekhalot* in order to reach the innermost shrine where the mystic would "behold the King in his beauty". The mystic's journey is also called a "descent to the chariot" or *yeridah la-merkavah*. As E. Wolfson has argued convincingly, this expression probably refers to the actual entry into the chariot, resulting in the enthronement of the mystic, his vision of the manifestation of God, and his participation in the heavenly liturgy.[44]

---

[42] Quispel, "*Asclepius*," 71.

[43] M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual", *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (1959) 30-38, 89-94; *idem*, "The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions", *Biblica* 50 (1960) 251-267; *idem*, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 247-259; J.-M. de Tarragen, "La Kapporet est-elle une fiction ou un élément of culte tardif?" *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981) 5-12.

[44] Wolfson, "*Yeridah la-Merkavah*", 13-45. For previous interpretations, see P. Bloch, "Die *Yorede Merkavah*, die Mysiker der Gaonenzeit, und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie", *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 37 (1893); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965); I. Chernus, "The Pilgrimage to the Merkavah: An Interpretation of Early Jewish Mysticism", *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (1987) 5; J. Dan, *Three Types of Ancient Jewish Mysticism*, The Seventh Annual Rabbi Louis Feinberg Memorial Lecture in Judaic Studies (University of Cincinnati, April 26, 1984) 34 n. 29; G. Stroumsa, review of I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, *Numen* 28 (1981) 108-109; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen, 1988) 226-227; A.F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 322 n. 77.

In some Jewish sources the *devir* or Holy of Holies is associated with God's bridal chamber.[45] This notion is reflected in the midrashic tradition which uses the simile of the Temple as a couch or bed in order to exegete Song of Songs 3:7, "Behold, it is the couch of Solomon":

> And why was the Temple compared to a couch? Because just as this couch serves fruitfulness and multiplication (*i.e.*, sexual intercourse), so too the Temple, everything that was in it was fruitful and multiplied" (*Tanhuma Num* fol. 17).[46]

The analogy between the inner sanctum of the Temple with the bed of Yahweh may be very early since already in Ezekiel's visions the association has been made between the Holy of Holies and the womb of Yahweh's wife (16 and 23).[47]

I suppose that the association of marriage with the Holy of Holies in Jewish tradition should not be too surprising since these two are connected semantically. The sacred act of marriage in Hebrew is קידושין or *kidushin*. The verb, "to marry a couple," is לקדש or *lekadesh*. The word for "Temple," is מקדש or *mikdash* while "Holy of Holies" is קדש קדשים, *kodesh kodashim*. In addition to its marriage connotations, לקדש also means "to consecrate" and refers to anything that belongs to God. Thus the whole semantic field surrounding the concept of marriage is equal to the semantic field of the Temple and, in particular, the Holy of Holies. It seems then that the expression "Bridal Chamber" is really equivalent to the "Holy of Holies" when one understands how these words functioned in Hebrew![48]

So it should not be surprising to find that, in the *Gospel of Philip*, marriage is associated with the third shrine of the heavenly Temple, the Holy of Holies. On one level, *Philip* talks about marriage as a sacrament in terms of its human institution. On another level, it is understood to be the great eschatological event, the Bridal Chamber, when the cleansed and transformed spirit finally enters the Holy of Holies, marries his angel, and is granted to see the Father face to face. Due to the constraints of language, confusion arises since human marriage is reflective of the perfect marriage

---

[45] For a full discussion, refer to R. Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1967) 88-95, cf. 226-233.

[46] Ed. Buber, 33.

[47] For a complete discussion, see J. Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife*, SBL Dissertation Series 130 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 89-125. It may be that the veil which separated the *hekhal* from the Holy of Holies (cf. Exod 26:33; Josephus, *B.J.* V, v, 5) represented her hymen.

[48] This insight developed out of a conversation I had with Rachel Elior in 1998.

which takes place in the heavenly realm. This is expressed succinctly in 76:6-10:

> In this world the union is one of husband and wife—a case of strength complemented by weakness[49]—in the eternal realm the form of the union is different, although we refer to them by the same names (*i.e.*, marriage and bridal chamber) (ⲉⲡϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ϩⲓ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϭⲱⲃ ϩⲙ ⲡⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲣⲁⲛ).

This means that for *Philip* marriage was a sacrament on two levels: in the way it was lived during the earthly experience of the couple; and as an end-of-the-world event when the angelic marriages took place in the Pleroma, the Holy of Holies or the Bridal Chamber.

a. *Human Marriage*

One of the most telling passages in *Philip* regarding human marriage is found in 64:31-32: "Great is the mystery of marriage! For [without] it the world would [not exist]" ([ⲡⲙ]ⲩ̣ⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲅⲁⲙ[ⲟⲥ] ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ [ⲡⲉ ⲁϫⲛ̄]ⲧ̣ϥ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥ[ⲙⲟ]ⲥ̣ ⲛⲁϣⲱ[ⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ]). Here, human marriage is associated with procreation. Furthermore, the marital union that *Philip* demands for his followers differs from the normal marital practices of non-Valentinians. *Philip* demands that the perfect human marital union be one controlled by pure thought rather than one controlled by sexual desire. Thus *Philip* refers to the former as "marriage of purity" (ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧϫⲱϩⲙ) (82:5) while the latter is "marriage of impurity" (ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲱϩⲙ) (64:36-37; 82:5).

In sacramental human marriage, known in *Philip* as the "marriage of purity," during sexual intercourse, the thoughts of the couple must not be adulterous, focusing on another lover. For if this were the case, the child conceived would resemble the lover rather than the spouse: "The children a woman bears resembles the man who loves her" (78:14). Nor must the couple's thoughts be focused on the world. For then the child who is born will resemble the world (78:20-25). What *Philip* proposes is that the couple direct their thoughts to God so that the child conceived will be of the spiritual race resembling the Lord:

> Now you who live together with the son of God, love not the world, but love the Lord, in order that those you will bring forth may not resemble the world,

[49] Text is corrupt, thus emended by Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,7*, 194: ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϭⲱⲃ.

> but may resemble the Lord (ⲚⲦⲱⲧⲚ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲯⲟⲟⲡ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲯⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲚ̄ⲙⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲯⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲍⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲥ) (78:20-25).

Because the partners have united with God in their thoughts and love, they draw the heavenly spirit or light down to rest upon their own spirits, thus conceiving children of the Spirit:

> Spirit mingles with spirit, and thought consorts with thought, and [light] shares [with light] (ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲉⲯⲁ[ⲣⲉ] ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲧⲱⲣ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲗⲟ[ⲩⲟⲥ] ⲯⲁϥⲣ̄ⲕ[ⲟ]ⲓⲛⲱ[ⲛ]ⲉⲓ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲟ]ⲩⲟ[ⲉⲓⲛ ⲯⲁ]ϥⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲉⲓ [ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ]) . . . If you become [a spirit], it is the spirit which will be joined to you (ⲉⲕⲯⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ [ⲙ̄ ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄] ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ). If you become thought, it is thought which will mingle with you (ⲉⲕ[ⲯⲁⲛⲯ]ⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ ⲡⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲱϩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲕ). If you become light, it is the light which will share with you (ⲉ[ⲕ]ⲯⲁⲛⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲕ). If you become one of those who belong above, it is those who belong above who will rest upon you (ⲉⲕⲯⲁⲛⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲣⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈) (78:29-79:5).

It is noteworthy that this section of *Philip* is immediately preceded by a passage which seems to be familiar with the *Song of Solomon*: "Spiritual love (ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙ[ⲁⲧⲓⲕⲏ]) is wine and fragrance" (77:35-36). Compare this with the *Song of Solomon* 1:2-3, "For your love is better than wine, your anointing oils are fragrant", and 4:10, "How sweet is your love, my sister, my bride! How much better is your love than wine, and the fragrance of your oils than any spice!" It may be that *Philip's* understanding of the marriage of purity which is to be governed by contemplation of the Lord may be one of the earliest Christian exegeses of the *Song of Solomon.*

At any rate, the mystical aspect of marriage according to *Philip* also is referred to in 81:30-82:26. In this passage, *Philip* states that sexual intercourse between married partners is done "in private" (ϩⲚ̄ ϩⲩⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ) in order to beget children. He says that the private procreative moment is a "mystery" (ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ) for every ordinary married couple. If procreation within the ordinary marriage of impurity is a mystery, *Philip* declares how much more mysterious is conception between partners of pure thought: "If there is a hidden quality to the marriage of impurity, how much more is the marriage of purity a true mystery!" (ⲉⲯⲍⲉ ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲍⲱϩⲙ ϥϩⲏⲡ ⲡⲟⲥⲱ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲍⲱϩⲙ ⲟⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲛⲟⲛ) (82:4-6). The proper marriage is the marriage that is based on "pure" (ⲧⲃⲃⲏⲩ) thought rather than mere "carnal" (ⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓⲕⲟⲛ) activity, "belonging not to desire, but to the will" (ⲉϥⲏⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱⲯ) (82:9). During sexual intercourse, the couple must send their will to heaven.

In so doing, they will draw down the light and at the mysterious moment of conception, the light will consort with the couple. Thus *Philip* states regarding this moment: "It belongs not to the darkness or the night but to the day and the light" (82:9-10). So sacred is this private mystical moment between the partners when heaven's own descends and mingles with them, that *Philip* declares sexual relations which are not conducted in private, to be "prostitution" (ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲓⲁ) (82:9-10).

Thus *Philip* explains that those who partake of the marriage of purity conceive "from the grace" (ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ) which is within their spouses (59:5-6). Associated with this is the emphasis in *Philip* on kissing between the perfect partners. Because they have been nourished with the body of the Perfect Man by partaking of the eucharistic elements, when they kiss each other, they conceive and give birth to perfect children (59:1-4). Even Jesus seems to be engaged in kissing activity with Mary Magdalene (63:35-36). The idea that life or the spirit could be transferred or exchanged by a kiss is a very old idea and probably underlies this particular behavior and interpretation.[50] It was through the kiss, *Philip* seems to say, that the perfect spirit of the child is conceived while the body through sexual intercourse itself. Thus marriage and conception involve physical activities as well as a mystical consciousness which invites the divine light to mingle with the couple in order that they may conceive a child of the spiritual race.

Of course, this ideology of marriage and sexual activity must be what Ireneaus is objecting to when he claims that the Valentinians believe themselves "to be perfect," "the elect seed" because they possess "grace" which has "descended from above by means of unspeakable and indescribable intercourse" (αὐτοὺς δὲ ἰδιόκητον ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρρήτου καὶ ἀνονομάστου συζυγίας κατεληλυθυῖαν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν). Thus the Valentinians maintain that "in every way it is always necessary for them to practice the mystery of intercourse (διὸ καὶ ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου δεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀεὶ τὸ τῆς συζυγίας μελετᾶν μυστήριον)." But for the non-elect, sexual intercourse is dangerous because it is not performed as a sacramental union but as an expression of sexual desire. Irenaeus quotes them as saying, "Whosoever being *in* this world does not so love a woman as to obtain possession of her (ὃς ἂν ἐν

---

[50] Cf. Gen 2:7; Jn 20:22; 1 Cor 16:20; OdesSol 28:6-7; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.9.6. See I. Löw, "Der Kuss", *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 65 (1921) 253-276, 323-349; K. Thraede, "Ursprünge und Formen des 'Heiligen Kusses' in frühen Christentum", *JAC* 11-12 (1968-1969) 124-180; G. Stählin, "φιλεω etc.", *TDNT* 9, 113-171.

κόσμῳ γενόμενος γυναῖκα οὐκ ἐφίλησεν, ὥστε αὐτῇ κραθῆναι), is not of the truth, nor shall attain to the truth. But whosoever being *of* the world (ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ κόσμου ὤν) has intercourse (κεράννυμι) with a woman, shall not attain to the truth, because intercourse with his wife resulted from desire (διὰ τὸ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ κραθῆναι γυναικί)." Those *in* the world but not *of* the world are the Valentinians who will attain to the Pleroma. They are expected to be involved in sacramental sexual practices as married couples. The psychics or ordinary Christians, however, are *of* the world. In order to attain to the "intermediate habitation" or the dwelling place of the Lower Sophia, they must practice "continence and good works (ἐγκράτειαν καὶ ἀγαθὴν πρᾶξιν)" (*Adv. haer.* 1.6.4). If they are sexually active, even during their marriages, they are involved in impurity and sin because their minds are focused on fulfilling the pleasures of their bodies rather than the will of their spirits.

Philip's understanding about the esoteric nature of sexual intercourse is very similar to that espoused by the Hermetics. According to both the Latin and the Coptic fragments of *Asclepius*,[51] intercourse is a great "mystery" (*mysterium*; ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ) (Latin *Asc.* 21; *NHC* 65:15-66:24) which reflects God's own creative potency. *Asclepius* 21 insists that "the mystery of intercourse" must be performed "in secret" (*effectus itaque huius tam blandi necessariique mysterii in occulto perpetratur*; ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ) so that the couple may not be disgraced in front of those who do not themselves partake in the esoteric reality of the sexual experience.

The esoteric reality of the sexual encounter is one that only the pious understand and perform. To the impious, the "holy mysteries" of incourse are "laughable and unbelievable". The pious direct their thoughts to the contemplation of their true divine selves so that the divine selves are able to mingle with the other, having arisen in both natures from the sexual coupling (Latin *Asc.* 21: *inperitis utriusque naturae divinitas ex commixtione sexus cogatur erubescere*). Unlike the pious, the impious focus on their passions which are an "incurable sore" gnawing at the soul. During intercourse, harmful desire dwells within the impious and blocks them from rising above pure matter (Coptic *Asc.* 67:9-20). Those, however, who listen to God imitate him by restraining their passions. Like the androgynous Father who "crafted

---

[51] For Latin, see A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* 2 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945) 259-401; for Coptic fragments, see D.M. Parrott, *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4, Nag Hammadi Studies 11* (edited and translated by P.A. Dirkse and D.M. Parrott; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979) 395-452.

all things by his own will" (*C.H.* V.7),[52] their thoughts and actions must be controlled by their own will (Coptic *Asc.* 67:25-28).

It seems that the Hermetics extended their ideas of self-contemplation to sexual activity, turning a generally carnal activity into the supreme meditative moment when the divine Mind within each sexual partner unites with the other. Thus, the Hermetics claim that the begetting of children is "a duty in life to be taken most seriously and greatly revered". Furthermore, "should any human being pass away childless", they suffer "the worst misfortune and irreverence". Accordingly, "after death such a person suffers retribution from demons" (διὸ καὶ μεγίστη ἐν τῷ βίῳ σπουδὴ καὶ εὐσεβεστάτη τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσίν ἐστιν ἡ παιδοποιία, καὶ μέγιστον ἀτύχημα καὶ ἀσέβημά ἐστιν ἄτεκνόν τινα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλαγῆναι, καὶ δίκην οὗτος δίδωσι μετὰ θάνατον τοῖς δαίμοσιν) (*C.H.* II.17). Is it possible that the Hermetics understood this reverent coupling to produce children filled with Mind, while the coupling of those who do not rise above the carnal pleasures of intercourse, was responsible for propagating those the Hermetics called "the souls of men devoid of Mind" (*C.H.* IV.3), mere fodder for death (*C.H.* I.18)?

This understanding of sexuality may help us to make sense of a difficult passage in *Corpus Hermeticum* I.18, a passage which has usually been interpreted by scholars as an example of a text advocating sexual asceticism: "let he who has Mind in him recognize that he is immortal, that *eros* is the cause of death" (ἀναγνωρισάτω <ὁ> ἔννους ἑαυτὸν ὄντα ἀθάνατον, καὶ τὸν αἴτιον τοῦ θανάτου ἔρωτα). Outside of its context, this passage smacks of sexual renunciation. But when viewed within its context, this interpretation becomes problematic:

> God immediately spoke a *holy* speech: "Increase in increasing and multiply in multitude, all you creatures and craftworks, and let he who has Mind in him recognize that he is immortal, that *eros* is the cause of death, and let him recognize all that exists". After God said this, Providence, through fate and through the cosmic framework, caused acts of intercourse and set in train acts of birth; and all things were multiplied according to kind. The one who recognized himself attained the chosen Good, but the one who loved the body that came from the error of desire goes on in darkness, wandering, suffering sensibly the effects of death (*C.H.* 18-19).

It seems that sexual activity itself is not the problem according to this passage, but sexual intercourse focused on *eros* or carnal desire. The one who

---

[52] See A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945).

directs his thoughts inward and contemplates his divine self, has risen to God and partakes in the esoteric reality of intercourse. Unfortunately, the Hermetics state that most people do not do this while having sex. They are led astray by their desire because they have focused their love on their bodies rather than their divine selves. In this way, they can not rise to the heavens during intercourse and, uniting with the divine, perpetuate immortality. Rather, they continue to wander around the darkness of the sense world, and through their ignorance will perpetuate death.

According to the Gospel of Philip, there are further advantages to the pure marriage. If the married couple have drawn down the spirit or light to consort with them during sexual relations, both are protected from the unwanton advances of evil spirits which would otherwise be free to fondle and defile them (65:3-26).[53] One receives this spiritual spouse from the marriage of purity which is called here, "the mirrored bridal chamber" (ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲓⲕⲟⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ) (65:13) since it imitiates the future marriage that will occur in the eschatological bridal chamber between the person's spirit and his angel. Thus the descent of the spirit or light is also referred to by *Philip* as the descent of an angel. If the partners unite their thoughts and love with God, the angel descends into their midst and unites with them during sexual intercourse (cf. 65:24-26).

According to *Philip*, this type of marriage is supposed to imitate the hierogamy of the Father and the Virgin Spirit who, in the great bridal chamber, conceived Jesus in order to reflect the pristine harmony of the pleroma (71:5-10). The conception was a fiery event in which the spiritual body of the aeon Jesus was begotten (71:6-9). He left the bridal chamber "as one who came into being from the bridegroom and the bride" (71:10-11).

Now such a union is to be enacted by human activity because its imitation helps to reestablish the harmony within the pleroma, a harmony which was lost when Sophia conceived outside the boundaries of marriage. This lost harmony was perpetuated after the creation of Adam and Eve when Eve followed Sophia's example and separated from Adam, having sex with him outside of marriage. So "Eve separated from Adam because it was not in the bridal chamber that she united with him" (70:22-23).[54]

---

[53] This is an old idea reflected in Genesis 6 and 1 Corinthians 11.

[54] The notion that Adam and Eve had sex outside of marriage may be connected to the popular belief that they had sex before they had reached adulthood; cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4; *Demonstratio* ch. 12; Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 2,25; Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 11,111,1.

Philip teaches that Jesus came to reestablish the lost harmony by restoring marriage and conception to its proper form. This was accomplished through Jesus' own conception and birth. Because Jesus' earthly conception and birth imitated the conception and birth of his aeonic body, the proper form of marriage finally was brought to earth, a marriage which mirrored the great hierogamy: "Christ, therefore, was born from a virgin to rectify the fall which occurred in the beginning" (71:19-21). Jesus came "to repair the separation which was from the beginning" by bringing, through his own birth, the divine bridal chamber to earth. Now those who imitate this divine union in their marriages "will no longer be separated" (ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲱⲧⲡ̄ ⲇⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲡⲁⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲕⲉⲧⲓ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲡⲱⲣⲥ) (70:20-21). The believers, by following the example of the divine marriage, will enter rest, reestablising the lost harmony of the pleromic world (70:10-22; 71:12-15; cf. 68:22-26).

It is fascinating how similiar ideas develop in the later Jewish mystical traditions where sexual imagery particularly becomes connected to the act of God's enthronement upon the cherubim seat in the Holy of Holies. In *Hekhalot Rabbati*, God's enthronement takes the form of a sacred marriage. Thus the mystic must recite when he enters the *merkavah*:

> Gladden the King who [sits] upon you [the throne], as the joy of the bridegroom in his bridal chamber (חשמח מלך שעליך כשמחת חתן בביתו חופתו).[55]

God's "embellishment is more exquisite than the embellishment of the bridegroom and bride in the house of their wedding" (חתנים וכלות בביתו חופתם).[56] Moreover, the faces of the angels are compared to "the appearance of the bride" (אפיהון כחיזו דכלא).[57] Therefore, God commands those mystics who have entered the *merkavah*:

> Bear witness to them of the testimony you see in me regarding what I do to the visage of Jacob, your father, which is engraved upon my throne of glory, for when you say before me, Holy, I bend down over it (literally: her), clasp it, embrace it, and kiss it, (קדוש כורע אני עליה ומנפף אותה ומחבק אותה ומנשק אותה) and my hands are on its arms, thrice daily, for you say before me, Holy, as it says, "Holy, holy, holy".[58]

---

[55] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 94. Cf. paragraphs 154 and 687; *idem*, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 105 and 185.

[56] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 159.

[57] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 353.

[58] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 164.

The sexual nature of the enthronement is alluded to in the Talmudic tradition as well, where emphasis is placed on the two cherubim between which the Shekhinah rests:[59]

> When Israel used to make the pilgrimage, they (*i.e.*, the priests) would roll up for them the veil and show them the cherubim which were intertwined with one another, and say to them: "Behold! Your love before God is like the love of the male and female" (*b. Yoma* 54a).

Such passages have caused E. Wolfson to treat the enthronement of God's manifestation as "a metaphor for a sacred union of the masculine and feminine aspects of the divine".[60]

Ingeniously, M. Idel connects this imagery with the talmudic dictum: "If a man and woman are worthwhile, the divine Presence dwells between them, if not—they shall be consumed by fire" (*b. Sotah* 17.a).[61] Idel suggests that this dictum should be interpreted as pertaining to sexual intercourse between married partners, an act whose performance, according to some Jewish traditions, affected the appearance of the Shekhinah on earth. Not only was the Shekhinah believed to be present during intercourse,[62] but if the union produced children, the Shekhinah would continue to dwell on earth.[63] Thus, according to Idel, this dictum suggests that "perfect sexual union influences the Divine Presence, causing it to dwell with the worthy pair".[64] Idel concludes that after the destruction of the Temple, the role of the cherubim as performers of the sacred union with God was transferred to human partners, thus partially perserving the sacred union by human activity.[65] The pure union of male and female in marriage restored the Shekhinah to her place on earth among the Jews, reestablishing the harmony that had originally existed in the Temple.[66]

In Kabbalistic traditions, it was believed that each person had an astral body which was linked to the image of God in which the human was created. Rabbi Eleazar of Worms says:

---

[59] Cf. *Midrash Tadshe*, Jellinek, *Beth Hamidrash* iii, 167.

[60] E. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 101.

[61] Cf. *Pirke de-R. Eliezer*, ch. 12, and *R. Tuviah ben Eliezer's Lekah Tov on Genesis*, 2:23.

[62] Cf. *Bereshit Rabba* 8,9 (p. 63); 22,2 (p. 206).

[63] Cf. *Yevamot* 63b-64a.

[64] M. Idel, "Sexual Metaphors and Praxis in the Kabbalah", in D. Kraemer (ed.), *The Jewish Family: Metaphor and Memory* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) 201-202.

[65] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 203.

[66] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 204.

> Each person has his form above, who is his advocate . . . an angel who guides that person's "star." And when he is sent below, he has the image of that person who is beneath him . . . And this is, "and God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him" [Genesis 1:27]. Why twice, "in his image/in the image of"? One is the image of man, and one is the image of the angelic being, who is in the form of that man (*Hokhmath ha-Nefesh* [Lemberg, 1876] 117-118).

This angel was understood to be the person's divine double which was imprinted on him at the moment of conception.

In the Zohar, the personal angel is understood to be a preexistent primordial shape or garment that the soul wears prior to entering the body. The Zohar says:

> When a man begins to consecrate himself before sex with his wife with a sacred intention, a holy spirit is aroused above him, composed of both male and female. And the Holy One, Blessed Be He, directs an emissary who is in charge of the human embryos, and assigns to him this particular spirit, and indicates to him the place to which it should be entrusted. . . . Then the spirit descends together with the image, the one in whose likeness [the spirit] existed above. With this image, man grows; with this image he moves through the world (III,43a-b).

Again in the Zohar it is stated, "at the moment of sex, the Holy One, Blessed Be He, sends a likeness that has the physiognomy of the person who is about to be formed imprinted and etched upon this image, and it stands over the act of intercourse. And were the eye allowed to see, he would observe above his head an image formed like the physiognomy of that person, and in that same image man is created (III, 104b)."

Thus, according to Idel, the later Kabbalists had developed this ancient idea of sacral marriage. They stated that when the husband and wife have intercourse, the husband's thought must "unite with the supernal entities" because his thought will draw "the supernal light downward". Then the light will rest upon the semen.[67] The goal of intercourse is procreation in cooperation with the Shekhinah by having sex with a mystical consciousness united with God. The union of the parent's human bodies produces the child's body, while the soul emerges from the spiritual realm through the union of pure thought with God.

According to Idel, in the Kabbalistic tradition, marriage and sex are "transformed into a mystery . . . whose success is crucial for both the divine

---

[67] Chavel, *Kitve ha-Ramban*, II,373.

cosmos and the lower universe".[68] Pure sexual relations were understood as participating mystically in the divine hierogamy by imitating it and influencing the harmony of the upper world.[69]

It seems that the idea of sacramental marriage was not uncommon in Jewish, Valentinian traditions and even Hermetic traditions. The notion seems to be based on an ancient view of sexuality—that it was more than a physical activity with physical consequences. The thoughts of the sexual partners either raised intercourse to a sacred height or drew it down to the depths of sin. When performed sacramentally, the spirit of the child conceived would resemble God. Being immortal, it would be drawn down from the heavens above to sojourn on earth until it returned to its spiritual origin at death. But when performed out of desire, the child would merely resemble the world and its darkness and become fodder for death.

b. *The Eschatological Bridal Chamber*

The great day of complete "restoration" (ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ) when the spirit of the person finally will enter the bridal chamber and marry his angel (67:16-20) will take place at the end of the world. Until that time, the bridal chamber, the Holy of Holies, remains hidden behind the veil (84:20-26). At the Eschaton, however, the veil will be rent "from top to bottom" (85:10) and the interior of the Holy of Holies will be revealed (84:25-26).[70] The world will be left desolate and the Demiurge will flee the cosmos. He, however, will not be able to flee into the heavenly Temple shrines because he "will not be able to mix with the unmixed [light] and the [flawless] pleroma" (84:27-34).

In contrast, the believers who "belong to the order of the priesthood" because they have prepared themselves sacramentally for entry into the Temple, will "go within the veil" led by Jesus "the High Priest" (ⲉⲣⲱⲁ ⲫⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲧⲫⲩⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲱⲥⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ) (85:3-5). The Ark of the Covenant is "their salvation" since they find themselves under "the wings of the Cross" (ⲥⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲫⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲫ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲣⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩⲱ ⲫⲁ ⲛ]ⲉⲩⲥⲃⲟⲉⲓ ⲧⲉⲉⲓⲥⲓⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲱⲱ[ⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟ]ⲩⲟⲩⲍⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲕⲗⲩⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲁⲫⲧⲉ ⲉⲫⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲟⲩ) (84:33-35). This state-

[68] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 208.

[69] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 210.

[70] Exegesis of Hebrews 9:1-10 seems to have contributed to the development of this description of the end of the world.

ment seems to reflect the Jewish tradition of the mystic's entry into the Holy of the Holies and his enthronement between the winged cherubim which overlaid the lid of the Ark. Thus since they are seated under the wings of the Cross upon the *kapporet* it can be understood that they have been enthroned and transformed. Now the secrets of the heavenly world can be revealed to them (85:18-20). The rending of the veil reveals the Holy of the Holies and they are invited into the bridal chamber (85:20-21).

Just as the light was drawn down to earth by the pure thoughts of the married partners, now in the heavenly bridal chamber "the perfect light will flow out to everyone". As children of the bridal chamber, they enter the Holy of Holies and permanently receive the light which is essential for their union (86.5). In so doing, they join in marriage with their angels, their alter egos or spiritual twins.[71] But for now, while on earth, this could only remain a great hope hidden until the end of the ages.

This eschatological hope, however, is foreshadowed in a saying that seems to have been part of the liturgical words spoken at their eucharist meal.

> He said on that day in the eucharist [ceremony] (ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ): "You have joined the perfect light with the Holy Spirit; also unite the angels with us, we ourselves as the images" (ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩϩⲱⲧ̄ⲣ ⲁ̄ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲡⲓⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ϩⲟⲧ̄ⲣ ⲛ̄ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲁ ⲛϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ) (58:10-15).

It may be that these particular words were part of a eucharist ritual meal which was performed during the marriage ceremony as it was performed in ancient Orthodox tradition and as it remains today in Roman Catholic tradition. During the wedding as recorded by *Philip*, the couple may have partaken of the elements, enjoining their angels to unite with them in holy matrimony. This, of course, supports the statement in 65.1-26, which explains that each marriage partner must receive his angelic power during the wedding, the "mirrored bridal chamber," in order to ward off lecherous demons. This means that the marriage itself was not a ritual, but was believed to be a "mystery" in the sense that it was a sacral union of two humans and their angels, especially during sexual activity. If any ritual was performed during the actual wedding, it probably was the eucharist which was perhaps followed by the act of consummation in the bridal

---

[71] Cp. Clement of Alexandria, *Extracts of Theodotus*, 21:1, 53:3; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 1.7.1, 1.13.6).

room (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.21.3). In this way, the human marriage of the couple was understood to be a sacramental union anticipating the eschatological marriage in the great Bridal Chamber.

It seems then that the sacramental experiences allowed the believer to mystically penetrate the heavenly Temple as far as the veil of the Holy of Holies. Through the sacraments of initiation and the eucharist meals, the believer gazed upon the Spirit and was transformed into the Spirit, beheld the Christ and was transfigured into Christ. Moreover, by enacting the sacred marriage through properly directed sexual activity, the believer participated mystically in the hierogamy taking place behind the veil and thus influenced the harmony of the divine world. *Philip* reminds the believer that at this third stage, the human is enacting the divine marriage, and in so doing: "You saw the Father" (ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡ[ⲉⲓⲱⲧ]) (61:31). But complete transformation into the Father must wait until the Eschaton when "you shall become Father" ([ⲕ]ⲛⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ) (61:31). In that divine bridal chamber, the believer will see his angelic self, "and what you see you shall [become]" (ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲯ[ⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ]ⲟϥ) (61:32-35).

Similarly, according to the *Extracts of Theodotus*, on the Lord's Day, the believers which have been purified and have passed into the second room of the heavenly Temple where they have discarded their soul bodies, are transformed into their pure spiritual bodies. Together with their angelic bridegrooms, they cross the threshold, passing into "the bridal chamber" (τοὺς νυμφίους). They "attain to the vision of the Father" (πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ὄψιν ἔρχονται), now "having become intellectual aeons, in the intellectual and eternal marriages of the Syzyge" (Αἰῶνες νοεροὶ γενόμενα, εἰς τοὺς νοεροὺς καὶ αἰωνίους γάμους τῆς συζυγίας) (64:1-65:1).

4. *Redemption*

"Redemption (ⲥⲱⲧⲉ)" is also called a "sacrament" in the *Gospel of Philip* (67:28-30; cf. 69:25-26; *Tripartite Tractate* 127:25) and is mentioned in the writings of the Church Fathers (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.13.6, 1.21.1-5; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 4.41). But, like marriage, I believe that it should not be understood as a ritual event. Rather it is the "mystery" of "being redeemed" by God, of entering the heavenly Temple (cf. 69:24-25).

Therefore, in *Philip*, it is associated with the standard ritual events. It is connected with baptism (69:25-26): "Baptism possesses the resurrection and the redemption (ⲡ[ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓ]ⲥⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥ[ⲓⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡ]

ⲥⲱⲧⲉ." In 62:15-17, it is associated with the eucharist, the "measuring" of Jesus. Thus: "'Jesus' in Hebrew is 'the redemption' (ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙ̅ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧϩⲉⲃⲣⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲡⲉ) . . . It is 'the Nazarene' and 'Jesus' who have been measured." This interpretation is particularly inviting when one recalls that according to 63:22-25, the name "Jesus" is also identified with the eucharist: "The eucharist is Jesus (ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅). For he is called in Syriac 'Pharisatha,' which is 'the one who is spread out,' for Jesus came to crucify the world." And finally "redemption" is associated with the eschatological Bridal Chamber (69:25-26): "As regards the redemption, it is in the Bridal Chamber (ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲉ ϩ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ)." At the end of the world, those who have entered the Bridal Chamber and its perfect light will receive the real chrism, not just the earthly type or image of it as they had formerly when on earth. This will "redeem (ⲥⲱⲧⲉ)" the "captives." Only then will they be able to marry their betrothed angels.

What I conclude from this is that, for the Valentinians who wrote *Philip*, there was an important esoteric distinction between their ritual performances and the performances of ordinary Christians: that is, the rituals performed by the Valentinians effected a deeper spiritual action than those performed by other Christians because the Valentinians believed that their rituals actually "redeemed" the person. This conclusion is supported by the evidence given to us by Irenaeus. He admits being confused about how the Valentinians understood "redemption" because they associated it with each of the different rituals. Irenaeus sorts this out by stating that some Valentinians associate redemption with baptism: the pneumatics automatically are redeemed when they are baptized, while the ordinary Christians, the psychics, receive only the remission from their sins when they are baptized (*Adv. haer.* 1.21.2-3). Other Valentinians connect redemption with chrism (1.21.4) or the anointing rites preceding death (1.21.5) so that "their inner man may ascend on high in an invisible manner as if their body were left among the created things in the world, while their soul is sent forward to the Demiurge." Still others claim that redemption was achieved through their sacramental unions in marriage (1.21.3). And finally, their were some who teach that "knowledge" itself was redemption because only the spiritual element in the human will actually be redeemed (1.21.4).

Although it is certainly possible that different Valentinian groups connected redemption with different rituals, with the evidence in *Philip*, it seems more likely that the Valentinians generally understood that all of their sacraments possessed the mysterious power of redemption, while the same sacraments did not for ordinary Christians. This interpretation would

also explain Hippolytus' enigmatic statement that the Marcosians performed a second baptism which is called "redemption." I wonder if the Marcosians had found it necessary to rebaptize their new converts in order to ensure their redemption once they left behind the ranks of the ordinary Christians.

5. *Conclusion*

This reconstruction of attitudes toward marriage in *Philip* certainly separates the Valentinians from other Gnostic sects which may have tended toward more encratitic lifestyles.[72] This study supports the conclusion that a sacramental marriage virtually was required between Valentinian Christians since it enacted and embodied the supernal hierogamy and the union of the transcendent aeons. This conclusion is in line with Clement of Alexandria's understanding of the Valentinians. In his famous tract *On Marriage* in which he vehemently writes against the encratitic lifestyle, he praises the Valentinians since they believe in the sanctity of marriage. He begins his book by stating: "The Valentinians, who hold that the union of man and woman is derived from the divine emanation in heaven above, approve of marriage" (Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Οὐαλεντῖνον ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῶν θείων προβολῶν τάς συζυγίας καταγαγόντες εὐαρεστοῦνται γάμῳ) (*Misc.* III,1,1). In the *Extracts of Theodotus*, he records that the Valentinians believe that procreation is "necessary for the salvation of the believers" because procreation must continue until all the children of the spiritual race have been born (67:4). Furthermore, so sacred is conception that it is compared to the mingling of the bodies of aeons Jesus, the Church, and Wisdom (17.1-4). Once the children are born, they are able to partake of the sacraments where they receive "the form of the Savior" and "become children of a bridal chamber" (ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μορφωθέντες Ἀνδρὸς καὶ Νυμφῶνος γεγόναμεν τέκνα) (68:3-4).

This sacramental theology may help to shed light on a perplexing passage in the *Extracts of Theodotus*. In 27:1-6, Clement of Alexandria discusses the ascent of the soul into the intelligible realm. The ascent of the soul is said to be the entry of the high priest with "the Name engraved upon his heart" (τὸ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐγκεχαραγμένον Ὄνομα ἔχων) into the Holy of Holies. Before entering the Holy of Holies, he must first enter "the sec-

---

[72] This is in contradiction to Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 211-214, who seems to associate all gnostics with encratism and the return to the primal androgyne state; also, in contrast, is M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 148-150.

ond veil" (τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦ δευτέρου), the *hekhal* where the altar of incense stands. The priest's body is said to already have been consecrated "like the golden plate" which is "pure and light through purification" since the body previously had been "engraved" with the "lustre of piety", being "clothed with the Name" (τὸ Ὄνομα περικείμενος).

The golden plate on the high priest's turban which has been decorated with the Tetragrammaton, is the body which has been consecrated through baptism and chrism, engraved with the Name. This investiture purifies the body so that the priest can enter the *hekhal*. As he enters, the body is laid aside revealing pure soul. Here he worships with "the angels who are the ministers of prayers carried aloft". Now he is ready to enter the Holy of Holies. As he does so, he is transformed completely into a spiritual body, as it were, "a body of the Power" (τὸ δυνάμεως). The work of "the Power" (τὸ δυνάμεως) is such that the person "becomes the bearer of God . . . as it were, his Body" (τὸ θεοφόρον γίνεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωτον . . . καθάπερ σώμα αὐτοῦ γινόμενον). Only then can the transformed person pass into the spiritual realm in order to "rest" with his "bridegroom", being granted "to see God 'face to face'".

It would seem that Clement is referring to a common Valentinian interpretation of the sacraments here, an interpretation not unlike what we have so far reconstructed from *Philip*.[73] The sacraments of baptism and chrism purify the body, etching the Name upon the person. This makes it possible for the person to enter the *hekhal* of the heavenly Temple. Within this holy room, the person is further transformed into the Body of God probably through partaking of the eucharist. Thusly transformed, he will be able to enter the Holy of Holies one day and marry his angel.

Illinois Wesleyan University
P.O. Box 2900 Bloomington IL 61702-2900

[73] This would argue for the case that this pericope represents Theodotus' views rather than those of Clement as Sagnard reconstructs: Sagnard, *Les Extraits de Théodote*, 11, 220-223. Thus, I agree with J. Buckley that this passage is consistent with Valentinianism. See her, *Female Fault and Fulfilment in Gnosticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986) 66-70.

L'ESPRIT SAINT ET LES ESPRITS MAUVAIS DANS LE *PASTEUR* D'HERMAS: SOURCES ET PROLONGEMENTS

PAR

NADIA IBRAHIM FREDRIKSON

Résumé. On s'intéressera tout particulièrement aux sources des enseignements dualistes de la pneumatologie du *Pasteur* d'Hermas, à la lumière des écrits qoumrâniens. On notera aussi que certains motifs à caractère dualiste, n'apparaissant pas dans les manuscrits de la secte, sont présents chez un auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle, Aphraate. Nous espérons par cette étude contribuer à la connaissance des sources et des prolongements des motifs à caractère dualiste caractéristiques de l'enseignement du *Pasteur* d'Hermas

Le *Pasteur* d'Hermas, ouvrage chrétien du second siècle centré sur la Pénitence, a été considéré comme une œuvre d'édification majeure au cours des premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne. Mais l'aspect sur lequel nous souhaiterions nous pencher est le caractère dualiste de la pneumatologie, par ailleurs très complexe, du *Pasteur* d'Hermas. L'étude de l'œuvre a en effet été renouvelée par la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte. La confrontation des motifs à caractère dualistes du *Pasteur*, et de certains écrits qoumrâniens, notamment le Manuel de discipline, et les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, nous mènera à une première question: dans quelle mesure Hermas est-il tributaire des enseignements de la secte de Qoumrân?

Il apparaît en outre que la doctrine à caractère dualiste de l'habitation des esprits en l'homme d'Hermas est fondée sur la *Septante* de *I Samuel* 16, 14. Or cette source, qui n'apparaît pas dans les textes de Qoumrân, est bien présente dans l'oeuvre d'Aphraate, auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle, qui offre par ailleurs des parallèles intéressants avec les écrits de la Secte, notamment dans son exposé adressé "aux membres de l'ordre". Un autre motif retiendra notre attention: c'est la métaphore du mélange – peu savoureux – entre l'absinthe et le miel. Nous n'avons pas trouvé d'autre attestation de ce motif singulier ailleurs que chez Hermas et Aphraate. Ces deux auteurs auraient-ils en commun, dans leur enseignement à caractère dualiste, des sources ne relevant pas directement des écrits qoumrâniens?

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 262-280

Le *Pasteur* d'Hermas est un écrit curieux dont la pneumatologie laisse encore maintes questions ouvertes.[1] Sans reprendre ce volumineux dossier, notre étude portera sur l'enseignement dualiste dans le *Pasteur*, ses sources et ses prolongements éventuels.

La question des sources d'Hermas a longtemps posé problème, et la recherche actuelle s'accorde à reconnaître que l'auteur est issu d'un milieu complexe où se recoupent des influences juives, païennes et chrétiennes.[2] En effet, Hermas ne cite explicitement aucune de ses sources, si ce n'est le livre d'*Eldad et Modat* (7, 4), apocalypse apocryphe juive aujourd'hui perdue.[3] Ajoutons pour notre propos qu'Hermas a pu avoir connaissance d'une version du *Duae Viae*, traité juif des deux voies dont on retrouve la trace dans la *Didachè, l'Epître de Barnabas* et la *Doctrina Apostolorum*.[4]

La recherche a été renouvelée par la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte, qui a mis en lumière l'importance des doctrines dualistes dans la théologie, l'anthropologie et l'eschatologie de la secte de Qoumrân.[5] Depuis lors, la pneumatologie du *Pasteur* d'Hermas est considérée à la lumière du dualisme essénien, et les études récentes ont mis l'accent sur les similitudes qui existent entre la doctrine des esprits dans le *Pasteur*, et l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits" de la *Règle de la Communauté*. Rappelons rapidement les principales étapes de la recherche.

A. Dupont-Sommer, dès 1953, a pressenti l'importance capitale de ces découvertes pour l'étude du christianisme primitif.[6] La même année, le Père Audet s'est attaché à montrer que le *Pasteur* d'Hermas est un ouvrage chrétien très fortement imprégné de judaïsme,[7] mais d'un type particulier: celui de la secte de Qoumrân.

---

[1] Pour les éditions du *Pasteur*, Whittaker, 1967, Funk-Bihlmeyer-Whittaker, 1992. Pour la traduction, Joly, 1986, que nous adapterons quand cela nous semblera nécessaire.

[2] Joly, 1992 a fait le point sur cette question, 552-586.

[3] La mention de cet ouvrage tendrait à montrer la familiarité d'Hermas avec la littérature apocryphe juive. Le livre d'*Eldad et Modat* est mentionné dans la *Stichométrie* de Nicéphore, cf. Burchard, 1965, 38; Denis, 1970, 142-145; Wilson, 1993, 162. Il semblerait qu'Hermas ait eu aussi connaissance de *IV Esdras* cf. Joly, 1986, 47, qui donne dans son édition les passages parallèles.

[4] Audet, 1952; pour le rapprochement entre le *Duae Viae* et le *Pasteur*; Rordorf – Tuilier, 1978, 22-34, posent le problème des dépendances littéraires éventuelles entre la *Didachè, le Pasteur*, et l'*Epître de Barnabas*. Voir aussi Philonenko dans Widengren – Hultgård – Philonenko, 1995, 180-181 note 123.

[5] Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1998.

[6] Dupont-Sommer, 1953, 200.

[7] Audet, 1953, 56, analyse un certain nombre d'expressions, notamment κύριος, qui, dans le *Pasteur*, ne désigne jamais le Christ, mais Dieu.

C'est dans les "préceptes dualistes"[8] qu'Audet trouve les arguments de sa démonstration. Dans l'enseignement sur l'Esprit Saint et les esprits mauvais, il reconnaît l'influence de l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits". De surcroît, il met en évidence que le motif particulier de l'Esprit Saint souillé chez Hermas est une expression technique relevant des enseignements de la secte. Cette découverte, comme on le verra dans la suite de cette étude, conduit Audet à établir une filiation directe entre l'auteur du *Pasteur*, et la communauté de Qoumrân.[9]

Filiation est bien le mot qui résume la conclusion d'Audet, puisqu'il considère qu'Hermas était un esclave, fils d'Esséniens emmenés à Rome après les événements de 70. Hermas aurait alors rejoint une communauté chrétienne où il aurait retrouvé des juifs de même tradition que lui.[10]

Cette étude, qui a suscité certaines réserves, marque cependant une étape décisive dans l'approche du *Pasteur* d'Hermas: il faut désormais compter avec les manuscrits de la Mer Morte.[11] Nous laisserons cependant de côté la question des origines esséniennes de l'auteur du *Pasteur*, car l'hypothèse d'Audet, même si elle est plausible, reste difficile à vérifier. Il est certain que si elle était confirmée, les doutes seraient levés quant à la nature des relations qui existent entre Hermas et la secte de Qoumrân.

C'est dans les "préceptes dualistes" qu'Hermas développe un enseignement à caractère dualiste dont on perçoit l'écho diffus dans le reste de l'œuvre. Parmi les motifs dualistes développés dans le *Pasteur*, son développement sur l'habitation des esprits en l'homme retiendra tout particulièrement notre attention.[12] Nous souhaiterions donc reprendre les passages

---

[8] Expression que nous empruntons à Joly, 1986, pour désigner les Préceptes V, VI, VII, VIII. Mais pour la numérotation, nous reprendrons la méthode de Whittaker et Joly, qui divise l'œuvre en chapitres et paragraphes.

[9] *Idem*, 64-65.

[10] *Idem*, Audet prend pour autobiographique le début de l'oeuvre, quand Hermas mentionne son ancienne condition d'esclave (1, 1); il note en outre qu'Hermas était un nom d'esclave juif fréquent à Rome, 80-81. Wilson, 1993, 67, considère Hermas comme un "essénien chrétien". Les autres chercheurs restent sceptiques quant aux informations d'Hermas sur son passé, et penchent plutôt pour la fiction littéraire, cf. Joly, 1986, 17-21; Leutzsch, 1989, suggère cependant que les éléments autobiographiques du *Pasteur* sont plausibles, 138-141 [140].

[11] Lluis-Font, 1963, 83-98; Joly, 1992, critique cette position et présente un état de la question, 533-535. Les études plus récentes de Brox, 1991, Haas, 1992, Wilson, 1993, prennent en compte une filiation entre Hermas et la secte de Qoumrân.

[12] Ainsi retrouve-t-on chez Hermas les motifs des deux Esprits 33, 4, des deux voies, 35, des deux anges, 36, et des deux désirs, adaptation du motif juif des deux *yeser* 44-46, cf. Brox, 1991, 541-546 [543].

qui pourraient être examinés à la lumière de l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits" et d'autres écrits de la secte, ou apparentés à son idéologie. On songe ici aux Ecrits intertestamentaires, notamment aux *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, dont la pneumatologie est très proche de celle d'Hermas, comme l'a souligné Dibelius à maintes reprises dans son commentaire du *Pasteur*.[13]

Le Pasteur, messager céleste apparu à Hermas en *Vision* V, lui prodigue une révélation spéciale sur la Pénitence destinée à la communauté.[14] Cette révélation comprend un enseignement à caractère dualiste sur l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme, et la menace que représentent les esprits mauvais qui s'efforcent de le chasser du "vase".[15] "Si tu es patient, l'Esprit Saint qui habite en toi sera pur de n'être pas obscurci par un autre esprit mauvais. Trouvant un large espace libre, il sera content, et il se réjouira avec le vase qu'il habite et il servira Dieu avec allégresse, puisqu'il aura en lui l'aisance. Mais si arrive un accès de colère, tout de suite, l'Esprit Saint, qui est délicat, se trouve à l'étroit sans espace pur, et il cherche à quitter ce lieu: il est étouffé par l'esprit mauvais, et il n'a plus d'espace où servir Dieu comme il veut, souillé qu'il est par la colère". (33, 2-3).

Le motif des deux esprits, si l'on s'en tient à l'Esprit Saint et la colère, s'inspire-t-il de la doctrine essénienne qui oppose l'Esprit de Vérité et l'Esprit de Perversion?

> Et Il a disposé pour l'homme deux Esprits
> pour qu'il marchât en eux jusqu'au moment de sa Visite:
> Ce sont les (deux) Esprits de Vérité et de Perversion.
> Dans une fontaine de lumière est l'origine de la Vérité
> et d'une source de ténèbres est l'origine de la Perversion (3, 18-19).

Ce sont donc les deux Esprits qui président à la destinée humaine. Cette doctrine d'origine iranienne a connu un développement particulier dans la secte juive de Qoumrân, et résume parfaitement le caractère dualiste de

---

[13] Dibelius, 1923. Pour l'édition des *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, Charles, 1908; Hollander-De Jonge, 1985. Pour la traduction française des *Testaments*, voir Philonenko dans Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1999, 817-944. A propos du caractère essénien des *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, Philonenko, dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 178 et note 106.

[14] La figure du Pasteur rappelle celle du *Poimandres*, cf. Reitzenstein, 1904, 13-36; Joly, 1986, 48-51. Pour le motif du dieu grec Hermès représenté comme un berger, Dibelius, 422-423; Joly, 1986, 49-51.

[15] Par les détails donnés sur la nature et la "psychologie" des esprits, l'enseignement du Pasteur s'apparente à une doctrine du discernement des esprits; cf. 33, 7-34; le passage a d'ailleurs son parallèle dans la doctrine des deux anges, 36, 2.

son enseignement: Dieu a crée deux Esprits antithétiques, qui incarnent le bien et le mal, symbolisés par la lumière et des ténèbres. Ces deux Esprits luttent dans le monde, et dans le cœur de chacun, jusqu'à la victoire finale du bien sur le mal. Le Pasteur évoque lui aussi l'antithèse de l'Esprit Saint et de la colère; si ce motif est au cœur du cinquième précepte, la pneumatologie, dans son ensemble, est beaucoup plus complexe.[16]

En effet, le passage (33-34) qui traite de cette question est particulièrement confus. Alors que l'on s'attendrait à l'évocation de deux Esprits antithétiques, Hermas oppose à l'Esprit Saint (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), appelé aussi esprit juste (τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ δικαίου) (34, 7) un esprit mauvais (33, 2), ou une foule d'esprits mauvais (34, 4-5), identiques dans les effets de leur nature perverse.[17] De cette confrontation de l'un et du multiple ressort une seule fois le motif des deux Esprits (ἀμφότερα πνεύματα, 33, 4) dans la rencontre entre l'Esprit Saint et l'esprit mauvais, la colère:[18] "que ces deux esprits habitent ensemble est donc un grand malheur pour l'homme en qui ils habitent".

Cette conception de l'homme mû dans ses sentiments et ses actions par des esprits trouve un développement particulier dans les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[19] Et c'est dans les mêmes termes qu'Hermas stigmatise les vices sous la forme d'esprits mauvais. Ainsi en est-il, par exemple, de la colère, du doute et de la tristesse.[20]

---

[16] Brox, 1991, 217-222, et 541-546; il ne fait pas directement référence aux textes de Qoumrân, mais aux auteurs qui s'y réfèrent [545, n. 4].

[17] L'usage que fait Hermas de l'expression "Esprit Saint" mérite quelques éclaircissements. Audet, 1953, 13-82 [61-63], suggère qu'il ne peut être question d'une hypostase de la trinité chrétienne, et rapproche l'Esprit Saint d'Hermas de la Sagesse dans la tradition juive. Voir aussi Dibelius, 1923, 399; Brox, 1991, 542; Haas, 1992, 556-557. Nous considérons que pour Hermas, l'Esprit Saint est l'esprit que Dieu a mis en l'homme, mais qu'il faut le distinguer de l'âme. Ajoutons qu'en 33-34, Hermas évoque presque dans les mêmes termes l'Esprit Saint et la patience, auxquelles il oppose la colère. Peut-être cette équivalence entre l'esprit (πνεῦμα) et la patience (μακροθυμία) vient-elle de la traduction de l'hébreu *ruah*, que l'on traduit généralement par pneuma, mais aussi par μακροθυμία, quand il s'agit de dispositions de l'âme, cf. Tengström – Fabry, 1993, 385-425.

[18] Cf. Philonenko, 1987, 388-400 [394]. L'auteur indique dans son étude les rapprochements à faire avec la tradition dualiste iranienne.

[19] *Testament de Ruben* 2-3, pour le motif des sept esprits d'égarement.

[20] 40, 1. Cf. *Testament Dan*, 2-4. Sur la pneumatologie du *Pasteur d'Hermas*, cf. Dibelius, 517-519; Haas, 1992. D'après Galien, le célèbre médecin de l'Antiquité, il existe cinq maladies de l'âme: la tristesse, la colère, l'emportement, le désir, la crainte, cf. Van der Elst, 1914, 43.

Le caractère dualiste de la pneumatologie d'Hermas apparaît aussi dans sa doctrine des deux anges, posée avec plus de rigueur que celle des deux Esprits:[21]

> Il y a deux anges avec l'homme: l'un de justice, l'autre, du mal (36, 1).

Ce qui appelle un rapprochement avec l'enseignement de la *Règle de la Communauté*, qui évoque l'Ange des ténèbres, antithèse du Prince des lumières:[22]

> Dans la main du Prince des lumières
> Est l'empire sur tous les fils de justice:
> Dans des voies de lumière ils marchent;
> Et dans la main de l'Ange des ténèbres
> Est l'empire sur les fils de perversion:
> Et dans des voies de ténèbres ils marchent.

D'après le *Pasteur*, les esprits antithétiques ne peuvent cohabiter dans le même "vase" (σκεῦος), tandis que les deux anges sont simultanément présents avec (μετά) l'homme, comme les deux Esprits de la *Règle de la Communauté*. En outre, par leur nature, les deux anges du *Pasteur* rappellent les deux esprits précédemment évoqués: l'ange de justice est délicat (τρυφερός) (36, 3), comme l'Esprit Saint (33, 2);[23] mais parmi les oeuvres de l'ange du mal, apparaît la colère (36, 5).

Il convient également de souligner que la doctrine des deux anges, selon Hermas, est assortie d'une doctrine des deux voies:[24] "La justice suit une voie droite, l'injustice, une voie tortueuse. Suis donc la voie droite et unie, et laisse la voie tortueuse" (35, 2).[25] Ce motif, qui n'apparaît pas dans

---

[21] A propos des deux anges dans le *Pasteur*, Dibelius, 520-523, Daniélou, 1958, 414.

[22] 30, 20-21. Le texte fait référence à l'Ange des ténèbres, cf. 3, 21.

[23] On n'a pas trouvé d'interprétation vraiment satisfaisante de ce terme, dont la traduction "délicat" ne rend pas tout le sens. Cette formulation appliquée à l'Esprit Saint et à l'ange de justice semble être propre à Hermas. A propos du terme hébreu *'edaen* et de sa traduction en grec, cf. Kedar-Kopstein, 1986, 1093-1103 [1095]. On pourrait donc supposer que l'Esprit Saint et l'ange de justice sont délicats de par leur nature paradisiaque. Mais Hermas utilise aussi ce terme en mauvaise part, à propos de l'ange de volupté et d'erreur (ἄγγελος τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπατῆς), 42, 1. Par ailleurs, Hermas distingue les voluptés nuisibles (τρυφαὶ βλαβεραί) 65, 5, des voluptés qui sauvent (τρυφαὶ σώζουσαι) 65, 7, dans un exposé à caractère dualiste, 65.

[24] Cf. *Epître de Barnabas*, 18, 1b (Prigent-Kraft, 1971, 195-197); *Didachè*, 1, 1 (cf. Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978, 22-34).

[25] A propos des deux voies dans le *Pasteur*, cf. Taylor, 1893, 243-259, suggère qu'Hermas s'est inspiré de la *Fable de Prodikos* et de l'*Epître de Barnabas*, 18, 1c, qui associe le motif des deux voies et des deux anges. Voir aussi Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978, 22-34; Brox, 1991, 222-227.

les principaux écrits esséniens, est cependant expressément attesté dans le fragment 4Q 473:[26]

> 3. (Il y a) D[eux] voies, une bonn[e et une mauvaise. Si vous marchez dans la bonne voie Il vous protègera (?)]
> 4. Et vous bénira. Mais si vous marchez dans la (mauvaise) voie,
> 5. [Il vous maudira et vous insultera (?), et le mal] Il amène[ra] sur vous et vous détruira

Les Esséniens avaient donc connaissance d'une doctrine des deux voies, mais l'état lacuneux du fragment ne permet pas d'affirmer qu'elle soit associée à une doctrine des deux anges. On notera toutefois la mention d'ange[s de la destruction] à la ligne 7. Le thème des deux voies suppose un libre arbitre; c'est peut-être la raison pour laquelle il n'apparaît pas dans la *Règle de la Communauté*, qui pose le principe de la prédestination divine.[27]

Une autre caractéristique du dualisme qoumrânien doit encore être examinée avec soin. En effet, l'enseignement sur les deux Esprits et les deux anges est fondé sur l'antithèse de la lumière et des ténèbres. Dans quelle mesure la retrouve-t-on dans le *Pasteur*?[28] A priori, ce motif n'est pas directement présent dans les préceptes dualistes; mais il nous semble sous-jacent dans l'évocation de la dynamique de l'Esprit Saint et l'esprit mauvais en l'homme. Reprenons un instant ce passage.

Dans les paragraphe 33-34, il est question des conséquences néfastes de la colère (ὀξυχολία), et la nécessité de maîtriser ses emportements. On retrouve ici un thème cher à la philosophie grecque, celui de l'ἐγκρατεία,[29] présent aussi bien chez Philon,[30] Josèphe,[31] et dans les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[32]

Ainsi, comme l'explique le Pasteur à Hermas, quand la colère monte au cœur de l'homme, elle occupe tout le "vase" (σκεῦος) et l'Esprit, qui a besoin d'espace large, se sent à l'étroit.[33] Ce manque d'espace provoque

---

[26] Cf. VanderKam, *D.J.D.*, vol. 22, 289-294; et pour les deux voies, texte en anglais [293] dont nous avons proposé une traduction française.

[27] Cf. Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 181 et note 22.

[28] A propos du terme hébreu *hasak*, ténèbres, voir Lutzmann – Geraty – Ringgren – Mitchell, 1982, 576-277; sur l'origine iranienne de l'antithèse lumière/ténèbres, Philonenko, dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 163-171.

[29] Chadwick, 1962, 343-365.

[30] Philon d'Alexandrie, *De vita contemplativa*, 34, 103.

[31] Cité par Dupont-Sommer, 1959, 5e édition, 1996, 40.

[32] *Testament Dan*, 1, 7-8; cf. Haas 1992, 554-564.

[33] L'antithèse, du large et de l'étroit, qui n'appartient apparemment pas au vocabu-

l'obscurcissement de l'Esprit Saint, qui est enténébré (ἐπισκοτούμενον) par l'esprit mauvais (33, 2). De même, dans le *Pasteur*, celui que possèdent les esprits mauvais engendrés par la colère devient "complètement aveugle, loin de la droite raison" (34, 7).[34] Nous sommes bien dans le champ sémantique du dualisme qoumrânien: c'est l'Esprit de perversité qui provoque l'aveuglement et entraîne l'homme dans les ténèbres (*Règle de la Communauté*, 4, 11). On peut donc, sans forcer le texte, rapprocher les thèmes de l'esprit enténébré, et de l'aveuglement, et considérer la colère comme un esprit de ténèbres, et implicitement l'Esprit Saint, comme un esprit de lumière.[35]

Par ailleurs, Hermas représente les esprits saints et les esprits mauvais sous les traits de douze vierges vêtues de blanc et douze femmes vêtues de noir.[36] Ainsi personnifiés, les esprits sont revêtus selon leur nature de couleurs qui symbolisent la lumière et les ténèbres.[37] Un autre motif spécifique de la rencontre des deux esprits dans le *Pasteur*, est celui de la "souillure".

En effet, l'Esprit Saint est "souillé" (μιαινούμενον) par la colère (33, 3). A notre connaissance, cette métaphore n'apparaît que dans deux écrits qoumrâniens.[38] Audet a en effet montré que l'expression "Esprit Saint souillé" apparaît deux fois dans l'*Ecrit de Damas*, ce qui, pour lui, suffirait à justifier une dépendance littéraire entre ces deux œuvres.[39] Plus récemment, A. Caquot, a retrouvé d'autres attestations de ce motif: l'une dans un nouveau fragment de l'*Ecrit de Damas*, et l'autre, dans le *Testament hébreu de Nephtali*.[40] Le thème de l'Esprit Saint souillé semble donc bien d'origine qoumrânienne, d'autant plus que dans la *Règle de la Communauté*, il est explicitement question de "l'esprit de souillure".

---

laire de la secte, est pourtant attestée dans une œuvre aux attaches qoumrâniennes dont Hermas s'est probablement inspiré, *IV Esdras*, Philonenko, 1971, 421-427.

[34] A comparer avec *Testament Dan*, 2-3.

[35] Haas, 1992, 555-557.

[36] *Le Pasteur*, 79, 3-4; 86, 5; Leutzsch, 1989, 179-185.

[37] Cf. Brox, 1991, 403 ss. Ajoutons que dans le *Pasteur*, les vierges sont à la fois des esprits saints, et les puissances du Fils de Dieu, 90, 2; les femmes sont implicitement associées à des puissances mauvaises (90,8-9; 103, 8).

[38] Brox, 1991, 219, suggère que c'est la demeure qui est souillée; et non l'esprit Saint. Mais cette lecture ne nous semble guère satisfaisante, vu le contexte général du passage.

[39] Audet, 1953, 64-65, cite l'*Ecrit de Damas* 5, 11-12 et 7, 3.

[40] Caquot, 1994, 373-380, retrouve dans un nouveau fragment de l'*Ecrit de Damas* l'expression "en souillant son Esprit Saint", et l'interprète comme l'esprit divin que Dieu

On lit en effet qu'au moment de la Visite divine seront "Finies toutes les abominations mensongères, fini le souillement par l'esprit de souillure". (4, 21-22). En l'absence d'autres sources, force est de constater que le motif de l'Esprit Saint souillé appartient au vocabulaire spécifique de la secte de Qoumrân. On notera entre outre que le motif de la souillure apparaît encore, mais en termes moins explicites, à propos de l'esprit de vérité.

En effet, une autre spécificité de la doctrine des deux esprits dans le *Pasteur*, est l'expression "esprit de vérité" pour désigner l'Esprit Saint.[41] Or, l'esprit de vérité est bien l'un des deux Esprits de la doctrine dualiste de la secte, opposé à l'esprit de perversion.[42] Selon M. Philonenko, ce motif est issu de la tradition iranienne qui oppose la vérité "*asa*" au mensonge, "*drug*".[43] Pour Hermas, l'antithèse de l'esprit de vérité n'est exactement le mensonge, mais la mauvaise conscience, consécutive au mensonge:[44] "Tu aurais dû, comme serviteur de Dieu, marcher dans la vérité, ne pas faire cohabiter en toi une mauvaise conscience avec l'esprit de vérité" (28, 4).[45]

Cet esprit de vérité est d'origine divine; et "le Seigneur est vrai en toutes ses paroles et il n'y a en lui aucun mensonge" (28, 1).[46] Les menteurs pervertissent l'esprit donné par Dieu: "Car ils ont reçu de lui un esprit qui ne ment pas; s'ils le lui rendent mensonger, ils souillent (ἐμίαναν) le commandement du Seigneur et se font spoliateurs" (28, 2);[47] on retrouve ici le

---

a placé en l'homme. Dans le *Testament hébreu de Nephtali*, on lit: "Heureux l'homme qui ne souille pas le saint esprit de Dieu qu'Il a mis en nous".

[41] L'esprit de vérité apparaît une seule fois dans le *Pasteur*, 28, 4.

[42] *Règle de la Communauté*, 3, 18-19; 4, 23-26.

[43] Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 171.

[44] Les thèmes de la vérité et du mensonge sont particulièrement complexes chez Hermas. Ainsi, on apprend en (28, 5) qu'Hermas a beaucoup menti dans sa vie, mais le Pasteur lui enjoint d'écouter ses paroles: "observe-les: ainsi, même les mensonges que tu faisais antérieurement dans tes affaires obtiendront créance, puisqu'on trouvera vrai ton langage d'aujourd'hui". Dans un autre contexte, la vérité peut provenir du diable afin de perdre les justes: c'est ainsi qu'agissent les faux prophètes (43, 4). Cf. *I Rois* 22, 19-22; Wilson, 1993, 63-72.

[45] Le *Testament de Juda* oppose "l'esprit de vérité (πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) et l'esprit d'égarement (πνεῦμα τῆς πλανῆς)". Entre les deux, se trouve la "conscience intelligente", ce qui montre une évolution de la doctrine en plaçant entre les deux Esprits la "conscience intelligente". La "mauvaise conscience" d'Hermas est peut-être tout simplement la "conscience" qui a choisi le mensonge, plutôt que de l'esprit de vérité.

[46] A l'inverse, dans le IVe Evangile, le diable est appelé "père du mensonge" *Jean*, 8, 44.

[47] On aura noté qu'en 33, 3, c'est la colère qui souille l'Esprit Saint. Comparer ce passage d'Hermas sur le mensonge à *I Jean* 1, 8-10. Cf. Haas 1992, 568-570.

thème de la souillure évoqué précédemment: le mensonge et la colère ont les mêmes effets pervers.[48]

En outre, un rapprochement de notre passage avec le *Testament de Juda*, permet de préciser le rôle de témoin de l'esprit de vérité, qui rend compte à Dieu des actions humaines;[49] dans le *Pasteur*, ce rôle est celui de l'Esprit Saint dont il faut éloigner la tristesse: "de peur qu'il ne prie Dieu contre toi et ne s'éloigne de toi." (41, 5). Dans les deux cas, l'esprit de vérité, comme l'Esprit Saint, ont le même rôle d'accusateur auprès de Dieu.[50]

Si l'esprit de vérité est, comme on s'est efforcé de le montrer, une autre dénomination de l'Esprit Saint, la vérité est pour Hermas une vertu fondamentale. Nous en voulons pour preuve l'exhortation qui introduit l'enseignement sur l'esprit de vérité: "Aime la vérité, qu'elle seule puisse sortir de ta bouche (28, 1)".

Nous sommes à nouveau confronté à une expression à caractère technique qui rappelle singulièrement les impératifs de la communauté de Qoumrân. D'après le témoignage de Flavius Josèphe, les futurs membres de la communauté juraient "d'aimer toujours la vérité et de poursuivre les menteurs".[51] Mais chez Hermas, cette exorde n'implique pas la haine du mensonge: de l'antithèse attestée par ailleurs il ne retient que la formule positive. La formule "aimer la vérité" est également attestée dans la littérature intertestamentaire et les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[52]

Si l'expression "aime la vérité" peut apparaître chez Hermas comme la partie positive d'une formule antithétique incomplète, on relève à l'inverse un passage caractérisé une exhortation "négative" qui rappelle les écrits dualistes les plus radicaux. Dans le paragraphe consacré aux deux désirs, motif qui rappelle celui des deux penchants dans le *Testament d'Aser*,[53] le Pasteur formule un commandement de haine: "Ecarte de toi tout mauvais

---

[48] *Testament de Dan*, 3, 6: le mensonge est associé à la colère; et ces deux vices "vont à la droite de Satan".

[49] *Testament de Juda*, 20, 5: "L'esprit de vérité atteste toutes ces choses et accuse tous les hommes (. . .)".

[50] *Idem*, 20, 5; cf. *Haas*, 1992, 564-568. Le motif de l'Esprit accusant le pécheur apparaît aussi chez Aphraate: "Mais l'homme qui aura reçu l'Esprit aux eaux (baptismales) et l'aura contristé, ~ il le quittera avant qu'il ne meure, et il s'en ira, suivant sa condition, auprès du Messie porter plainte contre cet homme qui l'aura contristé" (*Exposé* 6, I, 296, Pierre, 1988, I, 402).

[51] Philonenko, 1998, 1, cf. Flavius Josèphe, *Guerre juive*, 2, 8, 141.

[52] Cf. *I Hénoch* 91, 13; *Testament Ruben* 3, 9; *Testament Dan* 6, 8. En 5, 1-2, il est spécifié "Haïssez le mensonge (. . .) dites chacun la vérité à votre prochain".

[53] *Testament d'Aser*, 1, 3, voir Hadot, 1970, 167.

désir, revêts-toi du désir bon et saint. Car revêtu de ce désir, tu haïras le désir mauvais, tu lui mettras un frein comme tu voudras" (44, 1). Cette formulation rappelle l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits (*Règle de la Communauté*, 4, 23-25)":

> Jusqu'à présent luttent les (deux) Esprits de vérité et de perversion dans le cœur [d'un chacun:
> (les hommes) marchent dans la Sagesse et dans la Folie
> et conformément au partage d'un chacun dans la vérité et la justice,
> ainsi il hait la Perversité;
> et (selon) son héritage dans le lot de la Perversion et (selon) l'impiété (qui est) en lui
> ainsi il abomine la vérité.

Mais le commandement de haine que nous venons de relever est unique dans le *Pasteur*. En effet, bien que l'auteur pose l'existence de principes antithétiques tels que les deux esprits, les deux anges, les deux voies, les deux désirs, sa théologie est fondée sur la toute puissance de Dieu et le soutien de l'Ange de pénitence aux croyants: "Et moi, l'Ange de la pénitence, je vous le dis: ne craignez pas le diable, car j'ai été envoyé, dit-il, pour être avec vous qui faites pénitence du fond du cœur et pour vous affermir dans la foi" (49, 1).[54]

Cette pénitence, largement ouverte à tous, paraît exclure l'idée d'une division des hommes en deux lots, les fils de lumière, et les fils des ténèbres, caractéristique de la doctrine dualiste de Qoumrân.[55] On trouve pourtant chez Hermas deux expressions qui pourraient paraître équivalentes à cette doctrine. La tour formée par des pierres éclatantes, en *Similitude* IX, est une allégorie de l'Eglise idéale. Mais ceux qui se sont souillés (ἐμίαναν) sont rejetés "du peuple des justes" (ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων) (94, 5). Dans la *Vision* III, texte parallèle à celui que l'on vient de citer, les pierres rejetées

---

[54] Cf. 48, où Hermas affirme que les croyants ont le pouvoir de triompher sur le diable; mais les hommes vides de foi deviennent ses esclaves: "il va alors vers ceux qui ne sont pas bien remplis (de la foi), il trouve de la place et entre en eux: il fait en eux ce qu'il veut; ils deviennent pour lui ses esclaves" (48, 4). On retrouve ici une variante du motif de l'habitation.

[55] Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko,1995, 177-178. Cf. Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1999, *Le Règlement de la guerre*, 191-226. L'expression fils de lumière est appliquée aux "membres de l'ordre" Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 2, Pierre 1988, I, 371; les fils des ténèbres sont les adeptes de Mani, *Exposé* 3, 9, Pierre, 1988, I, 279. Les Mandéens, eux aussi, connaissent l'expression "fils de lumière (*bnia nhura*) – fils de ténèbres (*bnia hsuka*)" cf. Philonenko 1995, 169 et note 55; reconnaît à cette expression un caractère qoumrânien, *idem*, 167-169.

de la tour sont les "fils d'iniquité" (υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνομίας) (14, 1).[56] Il y a donc séparation entre les justes, et les fils de l'iniquité, mais pas au terme d'une guerre eschatologique, comme dans les textes de Qoumrân: c'est Dieu qui effectue le tri entre les vrais croyants, et les autres (14, 1).

Mais ni les textes de Qoumrân, ni le *Pasteur* ne prônent un dualisme absolu. D'après la *Règle de la Communauté* (3, 25-26), c'est Dieu qui a créé les deux Esprits. La guerre finale des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres s'achèvera par la victoire du bien sur le mal, de la lumière sur les ténèbres. De même lit-on chez Hermas: "Le diable a le pouvoir de lutter, il n'a pas celui de triompher" (48, 2); mais c'est le Pasteur, l'Ange de la Pénitence, qui triomphe du diable.[57]

Nous avons jusqu'à présent relevé les éléments de comparaison entre l'enseignement à caractère dualiste sur les esprits dans le *Pasteur* d'Hermas, et la doctrine des deux Esprits dans les textes de Qoumrân, en élargissant notre étude aux écrits intertestamentaires. Pourtant, deux motifs spécifiques à la pneumatologie d'Hermas n'apparaissent pas dans cette famille de textes, et n'ont pas fait l'objet d'une étude approfondie.

Rappelons tout d'abord que la pneumatologie d'Hermas s'inscrit dans une dynamique de l'habitation – ou l'abandon – de l'Esprit Saint de la demeure qu'il occupe. Ce motif est fondé sur la *Septante* de *I Samuel* 16, 14. En outre, parmi les nombreuses métaphores dont use Hermas, on relèvera celle de l'absinthe et du miel pour figurer l'impossible cohabitation de l'Esprit Saint et la colère. Or, ces deux motifs propres à Hermas sont attestés dans les *Exposés* d'Aphraate, auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle. Ces deux auteurs seraient-ils tributaires de mêmes sources, indépendantes des textes de Qoumrân ?

En (33, 3), Hermas dit explicitement que sous l'effet de la colère, l'Esprit Saint est "étranglé" (ἔπνιγεν) par l'esprit mauvais (33, 4).[58] Le verbe "πνίγειν" apparaît une fois dans la *Septante* et une fois dans le *Nouveau Testament* dans des récits de "possession" par un ou des esprits mauvais – ou impurs.[59]

Selon le récit de *I Samuel* 16, 14 de la *Septante*, l'esprit de Dieu s'est retiré de Saül, et Dieu lui a envoyé un esprit mauvais qui l'étrangle: "ἔπνιγεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ κυρίου". Comme on l'a noté, Hermas décrit

---

[56] "ils n'ont eu qu'une foi hypocrite et ne se sont pas dépouillés de tout mal. C'est pourquoi ils n'obtiennent pas le salut (. . .)" 14, 1.

[57] *Le Pasteur*, 47, 7; 49, 1; Daniélou 1958, 144-145.

[58] En 41, 5, Hermas emploie l'expression "μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον", cf. *Eph.* 4, 30.

[59] *I Sam.* 16, 14 (seule occurrence dans la *Septante*); *Mc* 5, 18.

selon les mêmes termes l'action de la colère sur l'Esprit Saint. La similitude de la terminologie atteste une dépendance littéraire à laquelle Hermas apporte cependant deux nuances. C'est l'Esprit Saint, et non pas l'homme, qui est étranglé par l'esprit mauvais; il est ensuite chassé par la colère. En *I Samuel* 16, 14, c'est Dieu qui a retiré son esprit de Saül, pour le remplacer par un esprit mauvais: il n'y a donc pas choc entre les deux Esprits, mais bien plutôt va-et-vient de l'un ou de l'autre.[60]

Dans son *Exposé* 6, consacré aux "Membres de l'ordre", Aphraate veut donner des exemples convaincants du caractère discontinu de la présence de l'Esprit de Dieu en l'homme. Il commence par évoquer le cas de Saül: "l'Esprit Saint dont il avait été oint le quitta parce qu'il l'avait contristé – et Dieu lui envoya à la place un esprit tourmenteur. Quand il était opprimé par l'esprit mauvais – David jouait de la cithare".[61]

Aphraate, comme Hermas, désigne l'esprit de Dieu par cette expression spécifique, et non attestée en *I Samuel* 16, 14, "l'esprit saint". Il ajoute que Saül l'avait "contristé", précision qui n'apparaît pas non plus dans la source, mais qui donne lieu à de plus amples développements dans le *Pasteur*. Il définit en effet la tristesse comme le plus méchant de tous les esprits (40, 2); elle "attriste (λυπεῖ) l'Esprit Saint et le chasse" (41, 2).[62] Chez ces deux auteurs, la tristesse a pour effet de chasser l'Esprit Saint de sa demeure.

Un autre point qui a déjà retenu notre attention, le motif de l'Esprit Saint souillé, semble également attesté chez Aphraate. Dans son *Exposé* IX, intitulé "de l'Humilité", il examine différents cas de jalousie à travers des exemples scripturaires. Ainsi revient-il à l'histoire de Saül: "Quiconque se revêt de jalousie, le Mauvais habite en lui, ~ et habite en lui l'esprit souillé qui habitait en Saül".[63]

On retrouve donc chez Hermas et Aphraate une même conception, avec des nuances, de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint ou de l'esprit mauvais en l'homme, qui n'est qu'une variante du motif de l'habitation de Dieu ou du diable. Ainsi, selon Hermas, la colère a chassé l'Esprit Saint: "Mais quand il s'éloigne de l'homme, en qui il habitait, cet homme se vide de l'esprit juste et désormais plein des esprits mauvais, il s'agite dans tous ses

[60] Cf. Philonenko, 1987, note qu'à la différence de la tradition iranienne des deux Esprits, il n'y a pas mélange, mais "choc et percussion" d'un esprit qui chasse l'autre pour prendre sa place, 397-398. Voir aussi Seitz, 1959-1960, 87-88.

[61] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 16, cf. Pierre, 1988, I, 404; voir aussi *Exposé* 6, 14, 400; 6, 18, 409.

[62] De même, le doute et la colère attristent (λυπεῖ) l'Esprit Saint (41, 4), *Ephésiens* 4, 30. Cf. Dibelius, 531-536.

[63] Aphraate, *Exposé* 9, Pierre, 1988, I, 486.

actes" (34, 7).[64] Chez Aphraate, l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme n'est pas continue; et c'est en son absence que Satan prend sa place: "Lorsque l'Esprit Saint quitte l'homme qui l'a reçu, le temps d'aller et de revenir chez lui – Satan engage le combat contre cet homme – de manière à le faire dévier et que l'Esprit Saint s'éloigne définitivement de lui".[65]

L'idée de l'habitation de Dieu ou du diable en l'homme est par ailleurs bien présente dans les préceptes dualistes: "le Seigneur habite dans la patience, et le diable, dans la colère" (33, 3). De même lit-on chez Aphraate, à propos de l'Adversaire des fidèles: "S'il entend qu'un homme en qui demeure le Messie dit des paroles honteuses ou se met en colère, qu'il se querelle et se bat, – alors Satan sait que le Messie n'est pas en lui: – il vient et exécute en lui sa volonté. Car le Messie demeure chez les pacifiques et les humbles (. . .)".[66]

Il apparaît donc que Hermas, tout comme Aphraate, ont trouvé en *I Samuel* 16, 14 la justification de leur doctrine de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint – ou de l'esprit mauvais – en l'homme. Indépendamment de cette source, on retrouve chez les deux auteurs le motif de "l'esprit souillé", dont on a évoqué précédemment la rareté. On sera peut-être plus surpris de constater que ces deux auteurs font référence à la même métaphore. Certes, l'absinthe et le miel, pour évoquer la douceur et l'amertume, apparaissent quelques fois sous la plume des auteurs anciens.[67] Mais il est question de comparaison, en aucun cas de mélange.

---

[64] Cf. Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, 1988, I, 405: " Il est pour l'homme un recours: ~ à l'heure où il se sent agité, où son esprit n'est plus ardent et où son cœur tombe dans les pensées de ce monde, ~ qu'il sache que l'Esprit n'est plus en lui."

[65] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, 1988, I, 405. On peut supposer que l'Esprit Saint s'éloigne de celui qui pèche: "C'est que cet Esprit va sans cesse se tenir devant Dieu et voir sa face, ~ et celui qui a fait du tort au temple où il habite, il porte plainte contre lui devant Dieu" (*Exposé* 6, 15, Pierre, 1988, I, 404).

[66] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, I, 1988, 406. *Le Pasteur*, 33, 3. 6; 34, 6.

[67] Le terme d'absinthe ne figure pas dans la *Septante*, qui traduit le terme hébreu de *laʿ anah* par différents termes (πικρία, χολή, ὀδύνη, ἀνάγκαι), mais on le retrouve chez Aquila. Il n'est pas certain que *laʿ anah* évoque précisément l'absinthe, bien qu'il désigne une plante amère, voire un poison, cf. Seybold, 1984, 586-588. Les traductions françaises adoptent l'antithèse absinthe/miel pour *Proverbes* 5, 4. L'antithèse équivalente doux/amer se retrouve dans les *Ecrits intertestamentaires*: *Testament Gad*, 5, 1 (cf. *Esaïe* 5, 20) où elle est associée à lumière/ténèbres; *Vie grecque d'Adam et Eve* 24, 3; *Apocalypse grecque de Baruch*, 4, 15. Dans le *Nouveau Testament*, Absinthe est le nom de l'étoile qui empoisonne les eaux, *Apocalypse* 8, 11. Voir Dibelius, 515, pour d'autres exemples de la métaphore absinthe/miel. Le miel joue un rôle symbolique dans *Joseph et Aséneth*, 16, 8. Voir aussi Bousset, 1907, 312, pour le rôle du miel chez les mystes.

Pour Hermas, la rencontre de la patience et de la colère est comparée au mélange du miel et de l'absinthe: "Si tu prends une toute petite goutte d'absinthe et que tu la verses dans un pot de miel, n'est-il pas vrai que tout le miel est perdu, que tant de miel est gâté par si peu d'absinthe, qu'elle corrompt la douceur (γλυκύτητα) du miel, qui n'a plus le même charme (χάριν) pour le maître, puisqu'il est devenu amer (ἐπικράνθη) et a perdu son utilité ?" (33, 5).[68]

Aphraate reprend cette métaphore non à propos des esprits, mais du jeûne, et de la pureté qu'il exige: "Il ne convient pas en effet à un homme – de mêler le miel et l'absinthe –. Si en effet, l'on s'abstient de pain et d'eau –, il ne faut pas mêler injures et malédictions à son jeûne".[69] Quand Hermas évoque le mélange du miel et de l'absinthe, il se rattache à la tradition juive du doux et de l'amer.[70] Mais on notera qu'il existe un décalage entre le motif de l'impossible cohabitation des esprits, puisque la colère chasse l'Esprit Saint (33, 3), et la métaphore du mélange peu savoureux de l'absinthe et du miel. Elle ajoute cependant une nouvelle antithèse, douceur/amertume,[71] à celles, sous-entendues, qui précèdent: lumière/ ténèbres; pureté/souillure, étroit/large. Ainsi, dans le *Pasteur*, l'ange du mal est amer (πίκρος), (36, 4), tout comme les préceptes du diable (πικραίς), alors qu'il n'y a rien de plus doux (γλυκύτερον) que les préceptes de Dieu, (47, 6). Aphraate évoque dans les mêmes termes l'action de l'Adversaire qui s'insinue dans les fidèles: "S'il fait semblant d'être doux pour entrer chez eux, – ils ne le goûtent pas, parce qu'ils savent qu'il est amer".[72]

Pour Aphraate, le miel, c'est le jeûne qui est agréable à Dieu. Selon Hermas, c'est à la fois l'Esprit Saint, et la patience, dans laquelle Dieu se complaît. Aphraate compare l'absinthe aux injures et à la malédiction; pour Hermas, c'est la colère, dans laquelle demeure le diable.

Malgré ces différences de propos, les deux auteurs se rejoignent pour une même conclusion: il ne faut pas mélanger le miel et l'absinthe, car celle-ci corrompt irrémédiablement l'offrande faite à Dieu, qu'il s'agisse de la prière (33, 6) ou du jeûne. En outre, Hermas et Aphraate se rattachent à la tradition juive du doux et de l'amer: le miel par sa douceur évoque la divinité, tandis que l'amertume est propre au diable.

---

[68] De même, Hermas compare la tristesse mêlée à la prière au mélange du vinaigre et du vin (42, 3).

[69] Aphraate, *Exposé* 3, 2, Pierre, 1988, I, 271 et note 10.

[70] Cf. note 67. Brox, 1991, 219.

[71] 34.3.

[72] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 2, Pierre, 1988 I, 372.

Au terme de cet exposé, nous espérons avons montré que dans la pneumatologie foisonnante du *Pasteur* d'Hermas, certains motifs semblent attester une dépendance littéraire avec les textes de Qoumrân. Certes, il semblerait hâtif de vouloir reconnaître dans les Préceptes dualistes une reprise de "l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits" de la secte de Qoumrân. Nous avons en effet souligné que l'expression "les deux esprits" (ἀμρότερα πνεύματα) n'apparaît qu'une seule fois dans le *Pasteur*, et qu'il est par ailleurs surtout question de l'antagonisme entre l'un et le multiple, l'Esprit Saint et les esprits mauvais, qui nous ramène plutôt vers les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, notamment pour ce qui concerne la colère et la tristesse, considérés par Hermas comme deux esprits mauvais qui chassent l'Esprit saint.

Cependant, nous rejoignons Audet pour penser que l'expression "Esprit Saint souillé" apparaît comme le maillon le plus sûr de la chaîne. Cette formulation à caractère technique n'est attestée, pour le moment, que dans des écrits issus ou proches de la secte de Qoumrân.

Le motif des deux anges et des deux voies relevé chez Hermas a aussi été relevé dans les textes de Qoumrân; nous serons cependant plus prudents pour ce qui concerne une dépendance littéraire directe, car on s'est efforcé de montrer que ces motifs apparaissent dans d'autres écrits chrétiens des premiers siècles, et que le motif des deux voies est un "classique" de la sagesse de la Grèce antique.

Si depuis la découverte des textes de Qoumrân, l'attention s'est surtout portée sur le caractère "dualiste" de la pneumatologie d'Hermas, nous avons souhaité souligner un aspect qui nous semble tout aussi important, c'est le "modèle" qui structure sa pensée. En effet, l'enseignement dualiste d'Hermas s'inscrit dans le contexte de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme, de sa présence, ou son absence. On a montré que le motif de l'Esprit Saint "étranglé" s'inspire de la *Septante de I Samuel* 16, 14.

Aphraate comme Hermas appelle l'Esprit de Dieu "Esprit Saint", et désigne la tristesse comme une des raisons de l'abandon de l'Esprit Saint de la demeure où il habite. En outre, il connaît lui aussi le motif de la "souillure", puisqu'il décrit l'esprit mauvais qui habitait en Saül comme un "esprit souillé". Ces recoupements posent bien sûr le problème d'un lien éventuel entre Aphraate et Hermas; et la proximité littéraire entre ces deux textes est renforcée par l'usage qu'ils font tous deux de la métaphore du mélange de l'absinthe et du miel.

Aphraate s'inspire-t-il d'Hermas ? A priori, les deux auteurs n'ont pas le même propos, et si le message d'Hermas semble universel, celui d'Aphraate évoque les "membres de l'ordre" dont l'identification pose encore de nom-

breux problèmes, mais qui par bien des aspects rappellent les membres de la secte de Qoumrân.[73] Il nous semblerait plutôt qu'Hermas et Aphraate ont eu accès à une même source qui devait elle même fonder son enseignement de l'habitation de Dieu en l'homme sur *I Samuel* 16, 14; car c'est essentiellement sur ce point-là que les auteurs se rejoignent. Dans l'état actuel des recherches sur les textes de Qoumrân, il n'apparaît pas que ces motifs appartiennent aux écrits de la secte; mais de nouvelles découvertes permettront peut-être d'en savoir plus.

Quant aux liens éventuels entre Aphraate et la secte de Qoumrân, malgré des points communs frappants que l'on a rapidement évoqués, car ils n'entraient pas directement dans le cadre de cette étude, ils restent tributaires de notre connaissance du devenir de la secte après sa disparition. Et cette question, si elle était résolue, permettrait d'apporter un nouvel éclairage à certains écrits chrétiens des premiers siècles, dont, notamment, le *Pasteur* d'Hermas.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Audet, 1952, 1953: J.P. Audet, "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du *Manuel de Discipline*", *Revue Biblique* 59, 1952; p. 219-238 et 60, 1953, p. 43-82.

Bousset, 1907: *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907.

Brox, 1991: N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Göttingen, 1991.

Burchard, 1965: C. Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*, Tübingen, 1965.

Caquot, 1994: A. Caquot, "Nouveaux fragments de l'*Ecrit de Damas*", *RHPR* 74, 1994, p. 373-380.

Chadwick, 1962: H. Chadwick, "*Enkrateia*", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* V, Stuttgart, 1962, p. 343-365.

Charles, 1908: R.H. Charles, *The greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford, 1908.

Daniélou, 1958: J. Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, Paris, 1958.

Denis, 1970: A.M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*, Leyde, 1970.

Dibelius, 1923: M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen, 1923.

---

[73] Voir aussi l'étude de Jargy, 1951, à propos de l'expression syriaque *b'nay wabhnôth k'yomô*, qu'il traduit par "fils et filles du Pacte". Cette traduction est préférable à celle de Pierre, 1988-1989, (membres de l'Ordre). On notera que la traduction possible "Fils et filles de l'Alliance" rappelle les "Fils de l'Alliance", les Esséniens, avec lesquels les auditeurs d'Aphraate présentent des affinités, Pierre 1988, I, 113. Cf. Aphraate, *Exposé* 6: les "membres de l'Ordre" doivent respecter une discipline qui rappelle celle des Esséniens: ils doivent être tempérants, ne pas rire, ne pas s'enduire d'huiles parfumées, à comparer avec *La Règle de la Communauté*, 5, 4; 7, 14-15; et Flavius Josèphe, *La guerre des Juifs* paragraphe 123, traduit par Dupont-Sommer, 1959, 5e édition, 38.

Dupont-Sommer 1953: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris, 1953.

Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko 1999: A. Dupont-Sommer – M. Philonenko, *Les écrits intertestamentaires*, Paris, 1999.

Funk-Bihlmeyer-Whittaker, 1992: F.X. Funk – K. Bihlmeyer – M. Whittaker, *Die Apostolischen Väter, Griechisch-deutsch Parallelausgabe*, Tübingen, 1992.

Haas 1992: C. Haas, "Die Pneumatologie des *Hirten des Hermas*", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 27, 1, 1992, p. 552-586.

Hadot, 1970: J. Hadot, *Penchant mauvais et volonté libre dans la sagesse de Ben Sira (L'Ecclésiastique)*, Bruxelles, 1970.

Hollander – De Jonge, 1985: H.W. Hollander – M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Leyde, 1985.

Jargy, 1951: S. Jargy, "Les "fils et filles du Pacte" dans la littérature monastique syriaque", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 17, 1951, p. 304-320.

Joly, 1953: R. Joly, "Judaïsme, christianisme et hellénisme dans le *Pasteur d'Hermas*", *La Nouvelle Clio*, 1953, p. 394-406.

——— 1986: *Hermas, Le Pasteur*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, 2e édition, Paris, 1986.

——— 1992: "Le milieu complexe du *Pasteur d'Hermas*" *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 27, 1, 1992, p. 524-551.

Kedar-Kopfstein, 1986: B. Kedar-Kopfstein, article "*'edaen*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5, Stuttgart, 1986, p. 1093-1103.

Leutzsch, 1989: M. Leutzsch, *Dier Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"*, Göttingen, 1989.

Lluis-Font, 1963: P. Lluis-Font, "Sources de la doctrine d'Hermas sur les deux Esprits", *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 1963, p. 83-98.

Lutzmann – Geraty – Ringgren – Mitchel, 1982: H. Lutzmann – L.T. Geraty – H. Ringgren – L. Mitchel, article "*hasak*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 3, Stuttgart, 1982, p. 261-277.

Philonenko, 1971: M. Philonenko, "L'âme à l'étroit", *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, Paris 1971, p. 421-427.

——— 1987: "De l'habitation des deux Esprits en nous", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1987, p.388-400.

——— 1998: "Aimer la vérité et haïr le mensonge (histoire d'une formule)", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, séance du 29 mai 1998, à paraître.

Pierre, 1988-1989: M.J. Pierre, *Aphraate, le Sage Persan, les Exposés*, traduction du syriaque, introduction et notes, 2 volumes, Paris 1988-1989.

Prigent – Kraft, 1971: P. Prigent – R.A. Kraft, *Epître de Barnabé*, Paris, 1971.

Reitzenstein 1904, R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-aegyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1904.

Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978: W. Rordorf – A. Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)*, Paris, 1978.

Seitz, 1959-1960: O.J.F. Seitz, "Two Spirits in a man. An Essay in Biblical Exegesis", *New Testament Studies*, 1959-1960, p. 82-95.

Seybold, 1984: K. Seybold, article "*la'anah*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 4, Stuttgart, 1984, p. 586-588.

Taylor, 1893: C. Taylor, "The Two Ways in Hermas and Xenophon", *Journal of Philology* 21, 1893, p. 243-559.

Tengström-Fabry, 1993: S. Tengström – H.J. Fabry, "*(ruah)*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 7, Stuttgart, 1993, p. 385-425.

Van der Elst, 1914: R. Van der Elst, *Galien, Le traité des passions de l'âme*, Paris, 1914.

VanderKam, 1996: J. VanderKam, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, 22, Oxford, 1996.

Vööbus, 1988: A. Vööbus, *A History of Ascetism in the Syrian Orient*, III, Louvain, 1988.

Whittaker, 1967: M. Whittaker, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Die Apostolischen Väter I, Berlin, 1967.

Widengren – Hultgård – Philonenko, 1995: G. Widengren – A. Hultgård – M. Philonenko, *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*, Paris, 1995.

Wilson, 1993: C. Wilson, *Toward a reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, New York, 1993.

67000 *Strasbourg*, 36 rue Geiler

"MANY LAMPS ARE LIGHTENED FROM THE ONE": PARADIGMS OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL VISION IN MACARIAN HOMILIES

BY

ANDREI ORLOV AND ALEXANDER GOLITZIN

Among mystical testimonies circulating in the Eastern Christian tradition, two portentous descriptions of transformational visions can be found.

The first account is drawn from *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE and preserved in the Eastern Christian environment in its Slavonic translation. In this text the prediluvian patriarch Enoch describes his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory:

> And Michael, the Lord's greatest archangel, lifted me up and brought me in front of the face of the Lord . . . And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[1]

The second account is written a thousand years later and comes from *Philokalia*, a collection of Eastern Christian writings compiled by Nicodemus Hagioretes, in which Pseudo-Symeon conveys preparatory instructions for acquiring the vision of the Taboric light:

> Then sit down in a quite cell, in corner by yourself, and do what I tell you. Close the door, and withdraw your intellect from everything worthless and transient. Rest your beard on your chest, and focus your physical gaze, together with the whole of your intellect, upon the centre of your belly or your navel. Restrain the drawing-in of breath through your nostrils, so as not to breathe easily, and search inside yourself with your intellect so as to find the place of

[1] *2 Enoch* 22:6-10. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 139.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

> the heart, where all the powers of the soul reside. To start with you will find there darkness and an impenetrable density. Later, when you persist and practice this task day and night, you will find, as though miraculously, an unceasing joy. For as soon as the intellect attains the place of the heart, at once it sees things of which it previously knew nothing. It sees the open space within the heart and it beholds itself entirely luminous and full of discrimination.[2]

It is apparent that these two descriptions belong to very different symbolic worlds. In the first one, an adept, on his celestial trip, finds himself before the glorious appearance of the Lord, accompanied by the angels who extract the visitor from his earthly garments and anoint him with delightful oil. In the second one, he is led through darkness and "an impenetrable density" on the inner journey to the depth of his heart. The majesty of the celestial environment strikingly confronts the monotonous quietness of the inner contemplation. Still, something similar is recognizable in these two accounts. In both descriptions the visionaries eventually come to the same result—they behold themselves luminescent. Both accounts also stress the totality of this metamorphosis—mystical adepts of these visions become "entirely" luminous. It is, however, observable that in the two accounts the source of the divine light is different. In the first account, it comes from outside, namely from the glorious appearance of the Lord, depicted symbolically as the angelic anointing with shining oil. The shining oil, the "covering" substance of the transformation, serves as an additional detail which stresses the outer nature of the visionary's luminous metamorphosis.

The important feature of the second account which differentiates it from the first is the "inner" nature of the luminous metamorphosis—the illumination comes from inside, from the darkness of the soul, proceeding from the open space within the heart of the visionary.

Separated by a millennium, these two accounts serve as significant marks of the long-lasting theological journey from the outer transformational vision to its inner counterpart. On this journey the towering figure of the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius, remains prominent. The purpose of this article is to explore some of his concepts which in our opinion play a formative role in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

---

[2] Pseudo-Simeon, "The Three Methods of Prayer," in: *The Philokalia* (5 vols.; tr. G.E.H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, and K. Ware; London: Faber and Faber, 1995) 4.72-3.

The Background: Transformational Vision of the Kabod

In order to clarify the differences between the two transformational visions mentioned earlier, we must return now to the initial theological contexts which lie behind these two accounts.

The origin of the *Kabod* paradigm, which is formative for the vision in the Slavonic apocalypse, can be traced to Old Testament materials where one can find various polemics for and against the anthropomorphic understanding of God.[3] Weinfeld observes that the imagery of the enthroned divine glory known to us as the Lord's *Kabod* was "crystallized" in the Priestly and Ezekielian traditions.[4]

Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation.[5] In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle.[6]

Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source[7] but derived from early sacral conceptions.[8] In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced

---

[3] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31-8; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75-85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961) 1.210-20; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990) 87-590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191-209. On late Jewish anthropomorphism see: M. Fishbane, "The 'Measures' of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in I. Gruenwald *et al.* (eds.), *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 53-74; Arthur Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism* (New York: KTAV, 1937).

[4] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191.

[5] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982) 24.

[6] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191.

[7] For the roots of the theology of the priestly tabernacle see: T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 81-3.

[8] Weinfeld shows that "the notion of God sitting enthroned upon the cherubim was prevalent in ancient Israel (1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; Ps 80:2; 2 Kgs 19:15)." Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 192.

between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark,[9] his footstool.[10]

This motif of the enthroned Deity becomes a central image in the book of Ezekiel, whose *Kabod*[11] theology is similar[12] to the Priestly doctrine.[13] Mettinger observes that "in Ezekiel, the *Kabod*-conception proved to represent an earlier phase than that discovered in the P-materials."[14] He further stresses that the iconography of Ezekiel is closely connected with the idea of God's royal presence in his sanctuary.[15] This connection of the *Kevod YHWH* with the enthroned God can scarcely be divorced from its previously established usage in early royal contexts.[16]

Weinfeld notes that Ezekiel's persistent tendency to describe God's *Kabod* as a brilliant and radiant fire encased in a cloud is also a distinct characteristic of the Priestly writings.[17] He argues that in the Priestly and

---

[9] Mettinger stresses that "the most important aspect of the Ark in Solomon's Temple was that it served as the footstool of God." T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 87.

[10] M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30-8.

[11] The term *Kabod* (Heb. *kbwd*) occurs 199 times in the OT (24 occurrences in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 18 in the Chronicler's history, 38 in Isaiah, 19 in Ezekiel, occasionaly in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, 51 occurrences in the Psalms and 16 in Proverbs). The term *kbwd* can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" *Kabod* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearences in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *Kabod* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "*kbwd*" *TDOT*, 7.22-38.

[12] It is also noteworthy that Ezekiel and the materials of the Priestly tradition, such as Gen 5:1, share similar terminology, namely the term *dmwt*. The term *dmwt* appears 12 times in the Book of Ezekiel where it becomes a favorite terminology for the description of various divine and angelic "appearances." It occupies a prominent place in Biblical anthropomorphic debates. Both terms *kbwd* and *dmwt* are intimately connected through the notion of "hiddeness" of the Divine form/glory. Later Jewish *Shiur Qomah* traditions stress the aspect of the hiddeness of *dmwt*: "His *dmwt* is hidden from everyone, but no one's *dmwt* is hidden from Him." M.S. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 113. For a fuller discussion see A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 102-4.

[13] On the connections between P and Ezekiel see B. Stein, *Der Begriff "Kebod Jahweh"* (Emsdetten; Lechte, 1939) 299. See also T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 107-11.

[14] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 116-17.

[15] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

[16] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

[17] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 201.

Ezekielian writings the fire and cloud are inseparable elements of the apparition of God's Glory, where the cloud is the divine envelope which screens the Deity from mortal view.[18] In later Jewish and Christian traditions the radiant luminosity emitted by various celestial beings fulfills the same function, protecting against the direct vision of their true forms. In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in later apocalyptic traditions, God's "form" remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light.[19] This situation explains the wide use of the *Kabod* paradigm in the visions of light phenomena.

Kabod theology leads to the special type of transformational visions that can be found in various biblical and apocalyptic materials.[20] In the climactic points of these accounts, their visionaries normally "see" the extend of the divine glory, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. A classic example of such a transformational vision is the account of Moses' shining countenance in Ex 34 after his encounter with the Lord's *Kabod* on Mount Sinai. It is noteworthy that in the apocalyptic and Merkabah traditions the vision of the Lord's Glory ("the King in His beauty") increasingly becomes the main teleological point of the heavenly ascents.

Enoch's transformation in the Slavonic apocalypse also belongs to the *Kabod* paradigm. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis took place in the front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's "Face."[21]

---

[18] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 202.

[19] De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5. De Conick's research investigates the relationships between God's form and God's light, showing their complexity. She argues that in some traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light. "The visionary can only gain access to a vision of the deity through the deity's light." De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5.

[20] G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1-13.

[21] "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension). Andersen, 136.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. A significant detail in this description is that Enoch is not transformed into light but covered, "clothed," with the light of God's Glory. The use of delightful oil as a covering substance emphasizes this "covering nature" of the luminous metamorphosis.

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face, an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with that of Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face in the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun . . ."[22] Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at his face.[23] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

In spite of the dominant role of the *Kabod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the postbiblical rabbinic[24] and patristic environments which offered new under-

---

[22] Andersen, 160.

[23] Andersen, 160.

[24] It becomes especially notable in Hekhaloth mysticism, where the teleology of the mystical journeys came to be expressed in terms of descent into the Merkabah. On Merkabah and Hekhaloth mysticism see: P. Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156-80; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah tradition and the Zoharic tradition* (New York: KTAV, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) xi-xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980); Gruenwald, I. and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-40; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany:

standings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience.[25] Among the new notions employed for the purposes of such a paradigm shift was the prominent biblical concept of the image of God after which Adam was created.

In the Likeness of God's Image

Gilles Quispel in his book *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*[26] draws the reader's attention to an interesting tradition preserved in Homily II.12[27] of Pseudo-Macarius. From the homily we learn that

---

State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, "Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition; Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JJS* 22 (1991) 1-39; C. Newsom, *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer *et al.*, *Übersetzung der Hekhaloth-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Siebeck, 1987-95); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); N. Séd, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49-66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Maaseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

[25] On the issue of the interiorization of transformational visions see: A. Golitzin, "Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159-86; Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), "Forma lui Dumnezeu si Vedera Slavei. Reflectii Asupra Contraversei Antropomorfite Din Anul 399 D. Hr.," in: Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), *Mistagogia. Experienta lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998) 184-267; N. Séd, "La shekinta et ses amis araméens," *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* XX (1988) 133-42.

[26] G. Quispel, *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (SNT, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 57-8.

[27] There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; ed. H. Bertold, GCS; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1973). Collection II appeared in: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964). Collection III appeared in *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III* (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961) and *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homelies propres a la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez; SC, 275; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

"Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance" (II.12.1).[28] Further, another important passage in the homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (περιβολαίου) (II.12.8).[29] The text reveals a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created according to the image and likeness of God[30] and Adam's "very image (εἰκόνα) itself," speaking about them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about *tselem* (Heb. ṣlm) of Adam—the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.[31]

The term "image" (Gk. εἰκών) can be found in a number of significant New Testament passages. The most important of them for the purposes of the current investigation is the Pauline description of Christ as the "image of the invisible God" in Col 1:15, which has often been compared to the account of the creation of Adam and seen as part of Paul's Adam

---

[28] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York: Paulist Press, 1992) 97. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964) 107-8.

[29] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 100.

[30] It is important that Genesis 1:26 stresses that Adam's *ṣlm* was created after God's own *ṣlm*, being some sort of luminous "imitation" of the glorious *ṣlm* of God. Some scholars even argue that "in this way, the likeness that Adam and God shared is not physicality—in the normal sense of having a body—but luminescence." David Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body," 303.

[31] For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam see: David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299-314; S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 141; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 5.97; Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171-95; B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938) 11.

Christology.[32] This theological connection between Adam's creation after the image of God and Christ as the image of God has opened several possibilities for using ancient aggadic traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam in new Christian theophanic contexts. In Pauline writings we can also see peculiar terminological parallels in which the notion of image (εἰκών) becomes closely associated with such important theophanic concepts, prominent in traditional *Kabod* theology, as glory[33] (δόξα)[34] and form (μορφή).[35]

Other important theological developments in Gnostic[36] and rabbinic circles lead to a gradual "interiorization" of the *tselem* imagery. In postbiblical Jewish accounts, *tselem* is often identified with the luminous "clothing" of the human heart. Scholem's research shows that in Jewish mysticism *tselem* was also understood as a sort of "garment" of the soul, which "floats" over it. He observes that "this garment also becomes the soul's heavenly

---

[32] J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 15. Cf. also: A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie der Apostel* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922) 299; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 174-9; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 97-9.

[33] See for example 2 Cor 4:4: ". . . the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God . . ."

[34] H.A.W. Meyer, J. Weiss and J. Behm understand Paul's concept of μορφή as the divine Glory (δόξα), believing that "in Pauline sense, Christ was from the beginning no other than *kbwd*, δόξα of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God." See R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967) 104-5. One of the major exponents of the hypothesis, J. Behm, in Kittel's *TDNT*, argues that the statement in Phillipians 2:6 about the form of God corresponds closely with the statement in John 17:5 about the glory which "I had with Thee before the world was." *TDNT*, 4.751.

[35] Biblical scholars argue that μορφή and εἰκών are used as interchangeable terms in the LXX and in Paul. For example, an investigation of the Old Testament's connection between terms *ṣlm* and *dmwt* in the light of their translation in the LXX as μορφή lead scholars to believe that "μορφή in Philippians 2:6 is immediately related to the concept εἰκών, since the Semitic root word *ṣlm* can correspond to either of the two Greek words." R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967) 108. For the discussion of the body/image of Christ in Pauline thought see Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

[36] J. Fossum observes that in some Gnostic circles "'the shining,' 'image,' or 'likeness' of God, after which the body of the earthly man was fashioned appears as a separate entity, even some form of hypostasis." Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 16.

attire when it returns to Paradise after death."[37] This Jewish idea of the "inner" luminous *tselem* might well be already known in Christian circles, particularly in the Syriac environment.

It is also possible that Ephraem, Macarius, and some other Syrian Christian writers might have acquired the notion of the luminous human *tselem* through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, which attest to traditions about the original luminosity of Adam and Eve.[38]

It is noticeable that in the Macarian homilies and other Eastern Christian writings the notion of luminous *tselem* became gradually employed for the purposes of the internalized beatific vision. *Tselem* became utilized as a sort of theological counterpart to the classic concept of the divine *Kabod* which traditionally played a prominent role in Biblical and apocalyptic visions. Sometimes both imageries were used interchangeably.

In the patristic environment the concept of the image of God gradually became a "safer" way to convey visionary experiences of the light phenomena, especially after the anthropomorphite controversy of 399 CE,[39] when antianthropomorpic polemics[40] made it increasingly difficult to employ the traditional "anthropomorphic" language of beatific visions, including the classical *Kabod* imagery.[41] By the fourth century in patristic trinitarian

---

[37] Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 264.

[38] Cf. S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40.

[39] On the anthropomorphite controversy see: Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Graham Gould, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 549-57.

[40] On antianthropomorphic polemics see: Elizabeth A. Clark, "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *Church History* 59 (1990) 145-62; Lawrence Hennessey, "A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three Senses of Incorporeality," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 373-80; John A. McGuckin, "The Changing Forms of Jesus," in Lothar Lies (ed.), *Origeniana Quarta* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, Bd. 19; Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrola-Verlag, 1987) 215-222; David L. Paulsen, "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105-16; Gedaliahu Stroumsa, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* (1983) 345-58.

[41] Similar antropomorphic developments are also noticeable in postbiblical Jewish

debates about the divine light the *Kabod* terminology was almost completely substituted by the symbolism of the divine image.

A thousand years later, in Hesychast transformational visions of the Taboric light, the concept of the image of God still continued to play a crucial theological role. It is especially noticeable in Gregory Palamas' theology of the divine image which shows amazing parallels to the concepts and imagery of Macarius. Among them is an open employment of the Adamic *Gestalt*. Palamas, following Macarius, draws heavily on ancient traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam. In *One Hundred and Fifty Texts*, he argues that "Adam, before the fall, also participated in this divine illumination and resplendence, and because he was truly clothed in a garment of glory he was not naked, nor was he unseemly by reason of his

---

mysticism, with its gradual elaboration of the *ṣlm* concept. In Jewish tradition *ṣlm* played an important role in anthropomorphic developments. It was understood not simply as an abstract likeness but had a strong "corporeal meaning." See Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 174. See also: Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 251-73. Gottstein's research deals with a number of rabbinic texts that reveal this "corporeal" understanding of *ṣlm*. He argues that in some instances it is interchangeable with other Hebrew terms for the designation of "body," like the term *dmwt*. Speaking about these corporeal meanings of *ṣlm* Gottstein notes that ". . . Adam's *tselem* is his luminous body. In other sources, such as the story of Hillel washing his body [*Lev. R.* 34.3], the *tselem* referred to the physical body. *Tselem* can be thus refer to various levels, or aspects, all of which bear a resemblance to the physical body. I would propose that these various levels, or various bodies, reflect one another. The physical body is a reflection of the body of light. This reflection may translate itself down to the details of circumcision. The kind of graded devolutionary process that we encountered above may be a model for two ways of talking about *tselem*. The *tselem* in its original form may be lost, but the dimmer reflection of this form is extant in the physical body, which may still be spoken of as *tselem*." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 188. Rabbinic literature gives a number of references to traditions about the luminosity of the original *tselem* of Adam. One of them can be found in *Lev. R.* 20.2. in which "Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 4. 252. Another important passage which can be found in *Gen. R.* 20.12 tells us that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" instead of "garments of skin," stressing thus that Adam has not lost completely his luminous quality even after the Fall: "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light (or)': this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 1. 171.

nakedness."[42] The Syrian background of Palamas' speculation about Adam is evident.[43] Recognizing the tragic consequences which Adam's fall had for the condition of the human *tselem*,[44] he reaffirms its irrevocable value for the inner transformational vision: "Leaving aside other matters for the present, I shall simply say that perfection of the divine likeness is accomplished by means of the divine illumination that issues from God."[45]

The theme of regaining this lost luminous image of God, "the dimmer reflection," which is still mysteriously extant in the human physical body (sometimes in the form of a luminous "clothing" of the heart) and can be eventually "restored," had a number of interesting theological ramifications in the Hesychast tradition.[46] The Hesychast idea of the light-like (φωτοειδές) sensitive nature of man[47] shows clear similarities with this early Syrian understanding of the luminous *tselem* as a reflection of God's Glory.

Internalization of the Kabod

It was mentioned earlier that in some biblical accounts the figure of Moses is often connected with *Kabod* theology.[48] This tendency is traceable both in the Old Testament Exodus stories and in New Testament accounts of Christ's Transfiguration where Moses serves as a significant "theophanic" reminder. In postbiblical Jewish and Christian writings the Moses *Gestalt*, however, gradually became utilized for the purposes of internalized visions. It cannot be a coincidence that in these new theological "developments," the Moses account was also linked with the *tselem* imagery.

---

[42] *Philokalia*, 4.377.

[43] An aggadic tradition, which survived in the Syriac environment, explains why Adam and Eve discovered their nakedness only after the Fall. According to the tradition, it happened because after their transgression they lost their original radiance—the "garments of light" which prevented them from seeing their naked "physical" bodies. Luminosity thus served for the prelapsarian humankind as a sort of screen which concealed their original form. Gregory Palamas clearly employs this tradition.

[44] "Even though we still bear God's image to a greater degree than the angels, yet as regards the likeness of God we fall far short of them." *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[45] *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[46] Cf. John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960-61) 186-205 and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 225-70.

[47] See John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 235.

[48] On Moses' connection with *Kabod* theology see: A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 2000) 130-47.

These tendencies are noticeable in the Macarian Homilies where Moses is often portrayed as Adam's luminous counterpart. Following the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius gives us Moses' example who "had a glory shining on his countenance." The homily refers to Moses' Sinai experience, expanding this tradition and adding some new significant details:

> Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food (II.12.14).[49]

It is noticeable that the passage serves as a bridge between the symbolic worlds of the *Kabod* and *tselem*. Macarius openly "internalizes" the Moses account, stressing that Moses' glory now "shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians." On the other hand, some features of the Kabod's paradigm are still noticeable: the homilist understands Moses' luminosity as a covering with God's glory.[50] The author's further discussion in II.12.15 about the clothing of Christians and wrapping them in "divine and glorious garments" gives additional strength to this motif of Moses, covered with the luminous garments of God's glory.

The tendencies for internalizing the *Kabod* paradigm through implications of the concept of God's image found in Macarian Homilies demonstrate amazing similarities to some Jewish developments. The late Rabbinic midrashim attest to such traditions.[51] The origin of such theological innovations can be found in its rudimentary form already in some Jewish apocalypses, notably in *2 Enoch* from which we learn that the Lord created

---

[49] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 114.

[50] The motif of covering with the Glory is also prominent in another Macarian passage which depicts Moses' shining countenance: "For blessed Moses provided us with a certain type through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze (II.15.10)." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74.

[51] In Rabbinic literature the traditions about Moses as a luminous conterpart of Adam also can be found. Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the *tselem* is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 182. *Deut. R.* 11.3 attests to such traditions: "Adam said to Moses: 'I am greater than you because

Adam after His face. F. Andersen stresses the theological uniqueness of such creational imagery. He, however, does not clarify what the creation after the Lord's face means in the broader textual context of the Slavonic apocalypse. The Lord's face plays an important role in *2 Enoch's* theophanic descriptions being identified with the Lord's glorious form—His *Kabod*. In chapter 22 of *2 Enoch* the Lord's face emits light and fire and serves as the source of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis. In this context, the creation of Adam after the Lord's Face demonstrates a remarkable effort toward merging the *Kabod* and *tselem* paradigms of the transformational vision.

The previous investigation shows the important role of Adam/Moses connection in the evolution from outer to inner in *Kabod* imagery. It is clear, however, that in the Macarian writings the internalizing of the *Kabod* paradigm is not confined solely to the reevaluation of Moses' *Gestalt*. The effort is much more radical. In fact, it is so revolutionary, that it strikes even distinguished students of the mystical traditions. One of them, Gershom Scholem, points to the amazing Macarian tendency for mystical "reinterpretation" of the Merkabah vision of Ezekiel in which the human soul becomes itself the throne of glory.[52] In Homily II.1.1-2 Macarius writes:

> When Ezekiel the prophet beheld the divinely glorious vision, he described it in human terms but in a way full of mysteries that completely surpass the powers of the human mind . . . And all of this which the prophet saw in ecstasy or in a trance was indeed true and certain, but it was only signifying and foreshadowing something no less hidden, something divine and mysterious, "a mystery hidden for generations" (Col 1:26) but that "has been revealed only in our time, the end of the ages," (1 Pt 1:20) when Christ appeared. For the prophet was viewing the mystery of the human soul that would receive its Lord and would become his throne of glory. For the soul that is deemed to

---

I have been created in the image of God.' Whence this? For it is said, 'and God created man in his own image' (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: 'I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me.' Whence? For it is said: 'his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated' (Deut. 34,7)." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 7. 173. Gottstein also gives another midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4 in which Moses is again Adam's luminous counterpart: "In the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt . . . In the beginning: 'and God created man in his image,' and in the desert: 'and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone.'" Cf. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1967) 3. 168.

[52] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schoken, 1961) 79.

> be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye.[53]

Scholem, observing such a radical rethinking of classic *Kabod* imagery, further asks the legitimate question: "was there not a temptation to regard man himself as the representative of divinity, his soul as the throne of glory?"[54] Interestingly enough, this query directs us to the very heart of the Macarian theological enterprise in which the *Kabod* internalization become possible only as a consequence of the unique interrelationships between human and divine in the event of Christ's transfiguration.

Crystallization of the New Paradigm: The Macarian Account of the Lord's Transfiguration

The previous analysis shows that in the Macarian homilies Moses' shining countenance and the luminosity of Adam's prelapsarian *tselem* serve as metaphors for major paradigms of the transformational vision.

In the Macarian writings, one can also encounter a third paradigm of luminous transformation which is radically different from the previous two traditions. In a peculiar Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration[55] on Mt. Tabor, the duality of inner and outer in *visio Dei* is attempted through in a new metaphor of the transformational vision—Christ's "Body[56] of Light."[57]

---

[53] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[54] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schoken, 1961) 79.

[55] The original Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem influenced by the *Kabod* paradigm in its classical Exodus' form. Several details of the account serve as important reminders: the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986) 1-19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 80-93; M.E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 305-17.

[56] The verb from the Synoptic account implies that Jesus' body was changed. Cf. J. Behm, *TDNT*, 4.755-7.

[57] Another important testimony to the Lord's Body of Light is *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 17.7 which pictures the brilliant radiance of Christ's body in connection with Christ's image: "For He has shape, and He has every limb primarily and solely for beauty's sake, and not for use. For He has not eyes that He may see with them; for He sees on every side, since He is incomparably more brilliant in His body than the visual spirit

Macarius makes an important theological statement when he observes that in His Transfiguration Christ was not just covered by the Glory but "was transfigured into (μετεμορφώθη εἰς) divine glory and into infinite light (εἰς τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄπειρον)" (II.15.38).[58]

In II.15.38 the homilist elaborates this ingenious understanding of Christ's transfiguration in which the internal and external aspects of transformational mystical experience are absolutely resolved:

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning.[59] Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies . . . (II.15.38).[60]

The language of the passage further reinforces the totality of this transformational vision—Christ's internal glory serves as the teleological source of his complete, luminous metamorphosis.

In the articulation of the newness of Christ's condition, Macarius thus offers a completely new paradigm of the beatific vision—the bodies of visionaries are now not simply covered externally with the divine light but are "lightened"[61] in the way as many lamps are lightened from the one:

---

which is in us, and He is more splendid than everything, so that in comparison with Him the light of the sun may be reckoned as darkness. Nor has He ears that He may hear; for He hears, perceives, moves, energizes, acts on every side. But He has the most beautiful shape on account of man, that the pure in heart may be able to see Him, that they may rejoice because they suffered. For He molded man in His own shape as in the grandest seal, in order that he may be the ruler and lord of all, and that all may be subject to him. Wherefore, judging that He is the universe, and that man is His image (for He is Himself invisible, but His image man is visible), the man who wishes to worship Him honours His visible image, which is man." A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950-51) 8. 319-20. It is important that here Christ's luminosity is placed into the account of Adam's creation after God's image. The phrase "He is incomparably more brilliant in his body than the visual spirit which is in us" deserves particular attention since it can refer to the correspondence between the Lord's luminous "body" and the Adamic *tselem*.

[58] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[59] Origen in *Princ.* 2.3.7 remarks that the best and purest spirits must have some kind of body, being changed according to their degree of merit into an ethereal condition, and interprets "change" in 1 Cor 15:52 as "shining with light."

[60] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[61] It is noteworthy that the homilist applies the imagery of "covering" not only to the physical bodies of these Christians but also to their souls which according to him

> Similarly, as many lamps are lighted from the one, same fire, so also it is necessary that the bodies of the saints, which are members of Christ, become the same which Christ himself is (II.15.38).[62]

In this new concept of the transformational vision, Macarius, however, sets a significant distinction between Christ's Transfiguration and human luminous transformation. In contrast to the Lord's metamorphosis, the bodies of mortals cannot be completely "transfigured into the divine glory" but rather simply become "glorified."

The hypostatic quality of Christ's luminous form is what differentiates Him from transformed Christians who are only predestined to participate in the light of His Glory and "have put on the raiment of ineffable light."[63] This articulation of the distinction between Christ's hypostasis and His light will play later an important role in Palamas' dialectics of God's essence and the divine energies.

Conclusion

It is time to return to the passage from the *Philokalia* which began this investigation. In comparison with the "traditional" cases of transformational visions, this account might look quite ambiguous. It demonstrates the absence of significant details of such visions in which the luminous metamorphosis of a visionary becomes possible as the consequence of the beatific vision of the glorious "form" of the Deity. The teleological necessity of such a divine form, in its external or internal manifestations, seems to presuppose the very possibility of any luminous metamorphosis. On the contrary, in the *Philokalia* account a visionary does not see any luminous form, but "the open space within the heart," which, however, makes him entirely luminous.

The answer to this strange situation can be found in the Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor which plays a paradigmatic role in later Hesychastic visions of the divine light. Macarius' position implies that Christ in the Tabor story represents both aspects of the transformational vision. First, He is the Glory after which a visionary

---

will be "covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[62] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[63] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 44.

is transformed. Second, He is also the visionary himself, whose face and garments[64] are transformed. In the Macarian writings Christ's interior glory is poured out upon his external body, making it luminous.

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning. Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies . . . (II.15.38).[65]

In the light of the Macarian account of Christ's transfiguration, the requirement for the divine glorious form as the transforming source of the visionary experience becomes substituted by the notion of the divine energies. It becomes possible since the locus of the visionary's perspective now is not external to the divine luminous form, but is rather immanent within it. In this situation the dichotomy between the subject of the beautific vision and the object of the beautific vision can be easily overcome.

A Hesychast in his transformational vision intends to resemble Christ in the Transfiguration. He focuses his physical and intellectual gaze not on the outside but on the inside, upon his heart, "where all the powers of the soul reside," waiting patiently that the interior power of Christ will lighten him as a lamp, so he can "become the same which Christ himself is." Divine glory here, just as in the *Kabod* tradition, is still confined within the anthropomorphic form, but there is a substantial difference—this human form is now the visionary himself, who imitates Christ's transfiguration, whose inner glory pours out exteriorly upon the body.

Marquette University, Milwaukee WI 53233

---

[64] The luminous face and the transformed garments of Christ in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration may stress the role of Christ as a visionary of His own glory. It parallels the shining face of Moses after his visionary experience on Mount Sinai and to the transformation of visionaries' garments in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

[65] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

THE SONG OF SONGS AND THE ASCENT OF THE SOUL: AMBROSE, AUGUSTINE, AND THE LANGUAGE OF MYSTICISM

BY

F. B. A. ASIEDU

I. *Augustine, Ambrose, and Allegorical Exegesis*

By his own testimony, Augustine was introduced to the allegorical interpretation of scripture by Ambrose of Milan. Augustine learned that the Old Testament could be interpreted in a figurative or allegorical sense in such a way that what Augustine had previously thought problematic and uncouth could now be read in a salutary way.[1] Ambrose's practice made patent a hermeneutical style that Augustine would adopt in his own work as a teacher and preacher of scripture. In its broad outlines Augustine's indebtedness to Ambrose is unquestionable. What is not always clear is how much Augustine followed Ambrose in his exegesis and interpretation of particular texts or books of scripture.[2] The Song of Songs offers an interesting case, for a number of reasons.

Perhaps no other work in the scriptures captured the allegorical imagination of early Christian thinkers as the Song of Songs. And none of the allegorical interpretations of biblical texts lent themselves to mystical thought as those centered on the Song of Songs. What is more, the Christian interpretative tradition that developed the line of thought on the Song of Songs as a description of the soul's embrace of God under the figure of a wedding song was shaped in an ascetic context. The ascetic renunciation that characterized Augustine's conversion in the Milanese garden in 386 would have made the allegorical-mystical appropriations of the Song apposite, if Augustine had been so inclined. The earliest literary remains of the allegorical, mystical interpretation of the Song occurs in Origen. The

---

[1] *Confessiones* 6.4.6; 6.5.8; *De utilitate credendi* 3.5-9.

[2] I leave out of consideration here Augustine's invocation of Ambrose's authority in his later works, which belongs to the theme of Augustine's appropriation of antecedent Christian tradition in the context of the Pelagian controversy.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

surviving evidence from Origen's ostensibly detailed and voluminous work on the Song consist of two homilies and a commentary which is a fragment of a much larger work.[3] In his prologue to his commentary, Origen proposes two distinct but complementary approaches to the Song: either we take the beloved as the soul of the bridegroom made in the image of the Word of God, or as the Church which the Word has redeemed, or both. These two become the standard approaches within the tradition.[4]

Ambrose of Milan borrows heavily from Origen, sometimes even to the examples Ambrose adopts in the course of his exegesis.[5] Ambrose often adapts the erotic imagery of the Song to describe the individual soul's ascent to God. His use of eros symbolism in speaking about the ascent of the soul to the divine and the union of the soul with God borrows also from certain Platonic and Neoplatonic themes with which Augustine was conversant. Augustine, after all, received his Neoplatonic apprenticeship in philosophy in Milan some time after learning from Ambrose how biblical texts could be interpreted allegorically (*Confessions* 6.4.5-6).

In spite of the acknowledged influence of Ambrose on Augustine's scriptural hermeneutics, and in spite of the unquestionably Neoplatonic elements in both Ambrose and Augustine's thought, Augustine rarely if ever uses the erotic symbolism inherent in the allegorical interpretations of the Song of Songs to speak about the union of the soul and God. Although well positioned to inherit this tradition, for reasons that are not entirely obvious, Augustine does not follow Ambrose. Peter Brown seems to suggest that Ambrose may have influenced Augustine's Platonism and mysticism at some point.[6] If Ambrose did, it is not evident in this one area: Ambrose's use of erotic imagery to speak about the soul's embrace of God. There is at least one reason for this. Augustine seems to have thought the use of conjugal or erotic imagery in speaking about the love of God as somehow inappropriate. And so the language of the kiss and

---

[3] Origène, *Homélies sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, introduction, traduction et notes de O. Rousseau, Sources Chrétiennes 37 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1953). Henceforth SC 37. I have adopted the following English translation: *Origen: The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*. Ancient Christian Writers No. 26 (New York: Newman Press, 1956).

[4] E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) 20-31, 87ff.

[5] See, for example, Bernard McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism, vol. 1. The Foundations of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century* (New York: Crossroad, 1994) 202-216.

[6] Peter R. L. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 194.

kissing (*osculari*) that is foregrounding at the opening of the Song of Songs and is so current in Ambrose's preaching hardly appears in Augustine.[7]

Whether or not Augustine had the privilege of hearing Ambrose speak on the Song of Songs is difficult to establish. If Pierre Courcelle is correct, some of the sermons Augustine must have heard during the year leading up to his conversion would have referred to the Song.[8] But even without hearing a fullfledged sermon on the Song, Ambrose alluded enough to the Song of Songs in his various homilies that it would have been difficult for Augustine to listen to Ambrose's sermons for any substantial period of time without being exposed to some of what the bishop of Milan thought about the Song. If Augustine missed any of the allusions to the Song of Songs in Ambrose's sermons, he would still have had one more opportunity during Easter Week 387, when Augustine joined other *competentes* to receive baptism from Ambrose.

II. *Ambrose, the Song of Songs, and the Eros of the Soul*

Ambrose's *De mysteriis* provides evidence of this.[9] *De mysteriis* 7.34 contains a description of what happened to the *competentes*. After receiving baptism, decked in white robes, the *compententes* now recognized as full members of the Catholic church, would receive instruction into the mysteries into which they had been inducted. The *De mysteriis* contains part of the instruction that Ambrose presented to the newly-baptized. Ambrose's instruction appropriates the bridal imagery of the Song of Songs in impressing upon the new converts their betrothal to Christ. Everyone who received baptism from Ambrose would therefore come away with some sense of the importance of the spousal imagery in the Song of Songs for their understanding of the great mysteries of the Catholic church which were now being revealed to them. Augustine would not be an exception. The

---

[7] Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967) 83, following Maria Tajo, Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 7 (1961) 127-151.

[8] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* (Paris: de Boccard, 1968 [2nd Edition]) 128-138.

[9] For Ambrose's *De mysteriis* I adopt the translation in *Saint Ambrose: Theological and Dogmatic Works*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, Fathers of the Church vol. 44 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963); and for *De Isaac uel anima* I adopt the translation in *Saint Ambrose: Seven Exegetical Works*, trans. Micheal P. McHugh, Fathers of the Church vol. 65 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1972). Henceforth FC 44 and 65 respectively.

nuptial and arboreal appositions in the Song of Songs would become part of the baptismal experience of Augustine.

The emotional weight of that experience is greatly obscured in the simple words in which Augustine describes them later in *Confessions* 9.6.14: "We were baptized and disquiet about our past life vanished from us." If nothing else, Ambrose's words at the baptismal ceremony would have reminded Augustine of a number of his past experiences. Augustine could easily see in the image of the Church as the bride some similarities between Ambrose's teaching and his own attempts at Cassiciacum, shortly after his conversion, to portray his love of Wisdom as an attempt to lay hold of wisdom in a nuptial embrace.[10] Augustine had replaced his old loves with Christ, the Word of God. Ambrose was to underscore this very theme. The impression on Augustine must have been indelible.

In fact, when Augustine recalls the time immediately after his conversion he seems to use the kind of appositions that Ambrose adopts in *De mysteriis* 7.35ff. In *Confessions* 9.3.3 Augustine writes of the arrow of God's love in suggestive images that could well come out of the Song of Songs (4.9f.) and Ambrose's *De mysteriis*:

> You pierced my heart with the arrow of your love and we carried your words transfixing my innermost being. The examples given by your servants whom you had transformed from black to shining white and from death to life, crowded in upon my thoughts. They burnt away and destroyed my heavy sluggishness, preventing me from being dragged down to low things. They set me on fire with such force that every breath of opposition from any deceitful tongue had the power not to dampen my zeal but to inflame it more.[11]

Speaking of the church in *De mysteriis* 7.35, Ambrose weaves together Song of Songs 1.4 and 8.5 in order to make the point that the newly baptized receive the beauty fitting of the church, the bride, because of the sacrament of faith: from black to white, from unbelief to belief, from lowly humanity to redeemed humanity, from sin to the life of faith through grace. All this, because "I am black but beautiful, O ye daughter of Jerusalem. Black through the frailty of human condition, beautiful through grace."[12] And Christ on seeing his church in pure vestments beholds pure souls washed in the waters of regeneration and says to her "Behold, thou are fair, my love, behold thou art fair, thy eyes are as a dove's." At the same

---

[10] *Soliloquia* 1.13.22.

[11] *Confessiones* 9.3.3. *Saint Augustine: Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 156.

[12] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.35. FC 44, 17.

time, "God the Word," says Ambrose, "is able to speak to the Church in the passionate language of the lover: Why art thou made beautiful and sweet, O love, in thy delights? Thy stature has become like the palm, and thy breasts as clusters of grapes" (Song of Songs 7.6,7).[13] The Church responds in the words of Song of Songs 8.1,2:

> Who shall give thee to me, my brother, sucking the breasts of my mother? I shall find thee without and shall kiss thee, and no one shall despise me. I shall take hold of thee and bring thee into my mother's house, and into the secret place of her who conceived me. You will teach me there.[14]

The gift of grace leads the Church into the interior mysteries of Christ. Christ is the groom who delights in the beauty of his bride the Church. Throughout much of *De mysteriis* the emphasis is on the ecclesial reading of the Song. However, in the background are vague echoes of the soul's embrace of the divine. The ecclesial reading predominates, but Ambrose assumes an easy translation from the ecclesial reading to the soul's embrace of the divine. So, as the Church, the bride, delights in Christ the groom, the individual soul of the newly baptized is to delight in Christ, the divine. Much of what Ambrose assumes in *De mysteriis* emerges more forcefully in Ambrose's *De Isaac uel anima*, the substance of which Augustine may already have been exposed to before his conversion.[15] What he would hear at baptism would therefore have confirmed what he had heard before under slightly different circumstances.

In *De Isaac uel anima*, Ambrose moves seamlessly from speaking about the Church as the bride of Christ to considerations of the individual soul as the beloved. The Church, like Rebecca, awaits its union with Isaac. So when we read "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth" we are to "think upon the Church, in suspense over many ages at the coming of the Lord, long promised her through the prophets."[16] We are to

> think upon the soul, lifting herself up from the body and rejecting indulgence and fleshly delights and pleasures, and laying aside as well her concern for worldly vanities. For a long time now she has desired to be infused with God's presence and has desired too, that grace of the word of salvation, and has wasted away, because he is coming late, and has been struck down, wounded with love as it were, since she cannot endure his delays.[17]

---

[13] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.39. FC 44, 19.
[14] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.40. Ibid.
[15] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* 128-138.
[16] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8. FC 65, 15.
[17] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8. FC 65, 15.

Song of Songs 1.2, a passage Augustine never quotes, is linked flawlessly with verse 8 of chapter 5, yet another text which almost never appears in Augustine's references and allusions to the Song, even though Augustine's language of love's wounds and the tardiness of his joy in the *Confessions* all but presuppose this element of delay and languor. Ambrose is unrestrained about the love sickness that frustrates the soul's desire for nuptial embrace.

> Turning to the Father, she [the soul] asks that he send to her God the Word, and giving the reason why she is so impatient, she says, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth." She asks, not for one kiss, but for many kisses, so that she may fulfill her desire. For as a lover, she is not satisfied with the meager offering of a single kiss, but demands many, claims many as her right, and thus has grown accustomed to recommend herself the more to her beloved.[18]

But the kisses, however many, are a mere prelude to wedded joy. In a remarkably detailed passage, Ambrose explains how much the kiss itself becomes the vehicle for a transmission of the substance of life, as if life passes from one to the other. The soul opens its mouth and pants, says Ambrose, and then expects its life to be revived in the kiss.

> For it is with the kiss that lovers cleave to each other and gain possession of the sweetness of grace that is within, so to speak. Through such a kiss the soul cleaves to God the Word, and through the kiss the spirit of him who kisses is poured into the soul, just as those who kiss are not satisfied to touch lightly with their lips but appear to be pouring their spirit into each other.[19]

Ambrose exploits the image of spousal, conjugal love and extends it to the representation of the soul's wedded embrace of the divine. Ambrose repeatedly refers to the lover as either God, the Word, or Christ, but names Jesus infrequently, as if somehow he is aware that it would be somewhat of a problem to speak about the soul embracing Jesus, who after all, appeared in the form of a man.

To underscore the intensity of the embrace and the conjugal symbolism Ambrose adds at one point that the soul does not simply love the outward appearance but everything about the lover. Not only "his face, as it were, but all his inner parts." That is why the soul adds to the favor of the kiss, "your breasts are better than wine and the fragrance of your ointments is above all perfumes."[20] Ambrose does what might at first glance

---

[18] Ibid. FC 65, 15-16.
[19] Ibid. FC 65, 16.
[20] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.9. FC 65, 16.

seem like a role reversal. Like Origen, Ambrose reads Song of Songs 1.2 in the voice of the feminine speaking to the lover about his breasts being better than wine. What is curious about this reading is that in the rest of the Song, all references to *ubera* invariably occur in descriptions of feminine characters (the bride [1.12b; 4.10; 7.1-13 etc.], the mother of the bride [8.1b], the sister [8.8]). It seems a little odd to have *ubera* in Song of Songs 1.2 referring to the male partner in the drama. Attuned to this oddity, Origen tries to obviate it by suggesting that what is entailed here is a reference to the "bosom" of the groom, in much the same way that the Gospel of John describes the "disciple whom Jesus loved" as inclining on Jesus' breast.[21] Ambrose follows suit.

In the soul's desire for the kiss, "God the Word poured himself into her wholly and laid bare his breasts to her, that is, his teachings and the laws of the wisdom that is within, and was fragrant with the sweet fragrance of his ointments."[22] The movement from the physical representation to the allegorical transposition of his breasts as the teachings of the Word, leaves much of the hermeneutical underpinning in the background, raising interesting questions as to why the allegory of the soul's desire for the kiss is necessary in the first place.

If the topoi in the Song serve to return the interpreter to the teachings of the Word then one might well suspect that the adaptation of the Song to the spiritual union between soul and the Word may be superfluous. Ambrose anticipates and precludes the objection. The Song, read as an allegory of the soul and the divine, points out that "the enjoyment of God is richer than the joy of any bodily pleasure." For Ambrose, the lowly forms of joy are refigured in the Song, so that the soul, held captive to the Word, finds "the fragrance of grace and the forgiveness of sin."[23]

Ambrose's version of the different stages of the soul's ascent is a steady progression from the desire for the kisses of the Word to the final embrace of nuptial union, with themes borrowed from Song of Songs 1.2 through 5.6.

> First, impatient of love and not bearing the delays of the Word, she asked that she might deserve his kisses [Cant. 1.2] and she deserved to see her beloved, and was also led into the king's chamber. Second, as they were

---

[21] Origène, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum* 1.2.4., texte, introduction, traduction et notes par Luc Brésard et Henri Crouzel, avec la collaboration de Marcel Borret. Sources Chrétiennes 375 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1991), 192-193. Henceforth SC 375.

[22] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.9. FC 65, 16-17.

[23] Ibid.

> speaking with one another, she rested in his shadow, and suddenly the Word departed from her in the middle of their conversation, yet he was not absent for long, for as she sought him, he came leaping over the mountains and bounding over the hills [Cant. 2.8]. Soon after, like a gazelle or hart, while he was speaking to his beloved, he leapt up and left her. Third, although she had not found him by searching in bed and at night, in the city and public places and streets, she finally summoned him back with her prayers and grace, so that she was even called closer by the bridegroom. Fourth, she is now awakened from sleep by him, although she was keeping watch with her heart so that she might hear his voice at once when he knocked. But while she was rising, she experienced a delay, because she would not match the swiftness of the Word. While she was opening the door, the Word passed by [Cant. 5.5-6]; she went out at his word, sought for him through wounds, but wounds of love [Cant. 4.9], and finally and with difficulty, found him and embraced him, so that she might not lose him.[24]

Elaborating on this "ladder of ascent," Ambrose argues, using Song of Songs 5.4, that the beloved awaits the entry of the Word as he sends his "good work through the opening in the door, as it were, still not face to face," increasing the sense of longing and anticipation. For Ambrose, the Word is recognized first in his works somewhat imperfectly. This increases the soul's love, and "once implanted grows in maturity; from the seeds which the soul received in a spiritual womb." The soul, an analogue to the Virgin, receives the Word in a spiritual womb which gives birth to spiritual life as the soul "longs to see the fullness of his divinity dwelling in him in bodily form," alluding to Colossians 2.9.[25] Ambrose's exegesis shows how easily the themes in the Song would have fit Augustine's conception of his new life in philosophy as a nuptial embrace of *Sapientia*. But what does Augustine do?

III. *Augustine's Early Use of the Song of Songs*

Of an estimated forty-five thousand scriptural citations in Augustine's works A.-M. La Bonnardière counts a hundred and sixty-four references to the Song of Songs.[26] La Bonnardière's points out that this amounts to an infrequent to extremely rare usage.[27] Augustine's first reference to the

---

[24] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 6.50. FC 65, 40-41.

[25] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 6.53. FC 65, 43.

[26] Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 1 (1955) 225-237.

[27] Cf. Elizabeth A. Clark, The Uses of the Song of Songs: Origen and the Later Latin Fathers, in *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Studies

Song comes in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (388/389), which is really his first published work after his baptism, even though he had worked on both the *De libero arbitrio* 1 and *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* while in Rome in 388. Augustine uses Song of Songs 4.12, "a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed" (*hortus conclusus, fons signatus*), in arguing for the boundaries of Christian society and liturgical communion. The idea of an enclosed garden, a fountain sealed off, and so preventing the uninitiated from entering in, becomes a recurrent theme in Augustine's encounters with Manichees and Donatists alike. In this, he would be developing a line of thought clearly present in Ambrose's preaching about baptism and its efficacy in Christian community. References to the Song feature in Augustine's later work as pointers to the waters of baptism and the initiation that brings people into the enclosure, and make them fit for receiving the mysteries.[28] Augustine's choice of which parts of the Song he uses and does not use are important even at this early stage in indicating his knowledge of the interpretive possibilities of the Song.

For example, one of the most memorable of Augustine uses of the Song is his adoption of Song of Songs 2.4 (*ordinat in me charitatem*). Given how much the theme of ordered love features prominently in Augustine's theological thought, beginning with *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* soon after his baptism, the very late use of Song of Songs 2.4b is rather unexpected and of little significance.[29] Why he turns to it so late is curious. Augustine gives ample evidence that he knows about the Song and the two main interpretative traditions surrounding it: one, as a description of the love of God and the soul and two, as a description of God's love for the Church. Moreover, Song of Songs 2.4a (*inducite me in domum vini*) and 2.5a and b (*constitute me inter unguenta, constipate me inter mella/quoniam vulnerata charitate ego sum*) appear in Augustine's exposition on Psalm 7, which is among the earliest of his commentaries on the Psalms that he wrote in 392 soon after he become a priest at Hippo.

What is more, we have from question 55 of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* an attempt by Augustine to make sense of the number of con-

---

in Women and Religion 20 (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986) 386-427. At p. 408 Clark suggests that the infrequent citations of the Song of Songs in Augustine indicates that Augustine "had little interest in the book."

[28] Augustine's *De baptismo* (401) is the classic text along these lines. At various points in *De baptismo* (4.7, 5.27, 6.3, 6.29, 7.51) he refers to Song of Songs 4.12. The references are provided by La Bonnardière, Ibid. 232-233.

[29] La Bonnardière gives five references (p. 231) to Song of Songs 2.4b (*ordinat in me charitatem*), all of which come after 410.

cubines referred to in Song of Songs 6.6 (*Sexaginta sunt reginae, octaginta concubinae, et adulescentulae quarum non est numerus*). Augustine proposes a highly allegorical reading of the passage. He treats the concubines as signifying the souls that seek and gain an earthly reward and as such do not receive the divine embrace. The exact details of Augustine's interpretation is not nearly as important as the attestation it provides of Augustine's willingness to read the details of the Song allegorically. It is impossible to fix with any precision exactly when Augustine conceived this way of interpreting the words of Song of Songs 6.6, since the general provenance of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* places most of the text within the period between 388 and 395. What it points out, however, is that Augustine and his friends were reading the Song of Songs during this period. And they were doing so with enough interest to think through how to interpret some of its details allegorically.

Perhaps the most curious of all Augustine's early references to the Song is found in *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7. There Augustine turns to Song of Songs 4.2 and uses it as a description of the bride being praised like a beautiful woman. "Your teeth are like a flock of shorn ewe ascending from the pool, all of which give birth to twins, and there is not a sterile animal among them."[30] Interestingly, Augustine picks up a part of the description of the bride that seems the most unexceptionable and applies it to the Church, while ignoring all that surrounds the verse that he selects. Augustine admits that the metaphor is strange, but he is not exactly sure why it moves him to think of the Church as a sheep whose teeth chew up those who teach error. Still, he finds delightful the idea of comparing the saints to the teeth of the sheep cutting off error and false teaching and moving them into her belly, once they have been softened.

Two aspects of Augustine's use of Song of Songs 4.2 are striking. First, *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7 says more about the delights of a text than about the "meaning" of the text. So it is unclear whether the "pleasure of the text" or the appeal of a particular metaphor determines the nature of Augustine's exegesis. And second, Augustine's choice of this particular metaphor in describing the beauty of the Church, which he himself admits to be somewhat awkward, seems arbitrary. The answer Augustine provides in *De doctrina christana* 2.6.8 that it is more pleasurable to think in similitudes does not quite resolve the problem of arbitrariness.

---

[30] *Augustine: De doctrina christiana*, trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1995) 63.

In addition, we have already noted how Augustine uses Song of Songs 2.4-5 in his exposition on Psalm 7 to speak about the wounds of God's judgment. Augustine's gloss follows the lines of thought suggested independently by Song of Songs 2.4a & 5. The gloss also implies that Augustine understands God's judgments as the wounds of love which recall the recalcitrant back into the presence of God, where love in all its frightful delights may be enjoyed. The intimations of death in Psalm 7.14 serve as a counterpoint to the idea of being inebriated with God's love in a wine cellar, as Song of Songs 2.4a hints. In spite of all this, Augustine does not show any willingness to use the Song as an elaborate template in describing the love of God and the individual soul in the way that Ambrose does.

If there is one constant element in Augustine early appropriations of the Song of Songs, it lies in his disinterest in adopting the conjugal symbolism of the Song. Augustine attempts none of the exuberant exegesis found in Ambrose. Comparing their respective citations to the Song of Songs does not even begin to capture how much Augustine departs from the Ambrosian model.[31] This is also interesting because Augustine's citations seem to depend on the same textual base as Ambrose's.[32]

La Bonnardière's general remarks about the similarities between Augustine and Ambrose do not highlight the manner in which Augustine's use of the Song involves picking and choosing his way through the putative text. Augustine, because he speaks from the standpoint of the lover, does not

---

[31] A.-M. La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 1 (1955) 225-237; Cf. Maria Tajo, Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 7 (1961) 127-151.

La Bonnardière suggests in a table how Augustine's citations bear resemblance to Ambrose's (236). The latter's *De mysteriis* would have been a source for Augustine when he went to receive baptism and there is every indication that that is where Augustine began to make the identification of the relationship between the nuptial hymn and the waters of baptism; the relationship between the bride (the church) and the groom (Christ) made all the more emphatic by Ephesians 5.23-32. Here is the background for the argument of Émile Schmitt's *Le Mariage Chrétien dans l'oeuare de saint Augustin: Une théologie baptismale de la vie conjugale* (Paris:. Études Augustiniennes, 1983). Augustine links Christian baptism to the marriage metaphor in his sacramental theology, since the mystical, spiritual marriage between Christ and the Church is the mystery that is emphasized in Ephesians 5.27.

[32] Solange Sagot, Le 'Cantique des Cantiques' dans le 'De Isaac' d'Ambroise de Milan. Étude textuelle et recherche sure les ancienne versions latines, *Recherches Augustinienne* 16 (1981) 3-57; Cf. La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, and Tajo's Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici.

cite any of the sections that have to do with descriptions of the lover, so that almost all of Chapter 3 he ignores or does not quote. The same goes for much of Chapter 7. Augustine's citations seem to avoid almost all the passages that have to do with the allurements of the feminine (what would correspond to the *blandimenta feminea* of *Soliloquia* 1.10.17). So although Augustine speaks in the voice of the lover when he adopts the spousal metaphor, he nevertheless leaves much of the language about the beloved untouched.

There are times when Augustine quotes parts of verses and ignores the rest. In other instances he will select passages around a given motif that he does not seem at all inclined to recall but will use sections in the near vicinity that do not break the pattern that he seems to have established for himself. A case in point is the reference to the teeth of the sheep in Song of Songs 4.2 which I have already alluded to. The passage appears in Ambrose's *De mysteriis* 7.38 in a section where Ambrose speaks about the imagery of the Song as a representation of the love of Christ and the Church. It is quite probable that this is the background that motivated Augustine's use of it. But while Ambrose uses the verse that immediately follows, "your lips are like a band of scarlet/and your speech is sweet" (Song of Songs 4.3: in *De mysteriis* 7.38), Augustine does not cite it ever.

An even more elaborate pattern is at work in Chapter 5. Augustine skips verse 1, cites verses 2 and 3, skips everything in between and cites verse 9. Verses 4-8 are about the lover entering the dwelling of the beloved and then disappearing to leave her longing. Augustine uses verse 3 (*Exui me tunica mea; quomodo induam eam? Lavi pedes meos, quomodo inquinabo illos?*) in a sense that has to do with the baptismal rite: where the one to be baptized takes off a tunic and receives the waters of baptism. Augustine transforms the entire context of the verse from being a prelude to conjugal union to the experience of baptismal regeneration. Ambrose does something similar. Ambrose, however, cites verses 1, 3 and 8 in his *De mysteriis*, and quotes verses 2 through 7 extensively in *De Isaac uel anima* 6.50-55. Ambrose also cites Song of Songs 5.8 and alludes to 5.1 in *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8 and 5.49 respectively.

If the text of the Song is printed with the sections Augustine's quotes highlighted it would reveal an intricate pattern. The "alter-text," the sections of the Song that Augustine does not use, point out something distinctive. It is in an indication of Augustine's disinterest in using conjugal or erotic love as a fitting metaphor for describing the love of God and the individual soul. The thematic elaborations of the Song, with its vivid descrip-

tions, seems to have engendered a mitigated silence on Augustine's part. I should note, however, that Augustine is far from censoring himself. He does not refrain from speaking and writing in some vivid details about human sexuality.[33]

Ambrose, on the other hand, does something Augustine never does. Ambrose, inspired by an image that ultimately goes back to Plato's *Phaedrus*, employs the erotic imagery of the Song of Songs to the fullest. In one instance Ambrose speaks of Christ mounting the soul, as if mounting a chariot. Ambrose combines the language of the winged chariot found in the *Phaedrus* 246-247 with Song of Songs 7.6-8, where the nuptial embrace is described as an ascent along the side of a palm tree. Ambrose's *De Isaac uel anima*, then, offers an entirely different interpretive impulse than anything Augustine proposes.

IV. *The Song of Songs and Augustine's Language of Love*

In *Confessions* 8.11.26 Augustine's old loves whisper in his ear asking him whether he can manage a life of total renunciation. If Augustine belonged to a group of diehards who saw asceticism as the only way forward[34] the route to that end was rather more tortured for him. The question posed to Augustine by the "overwhelming force of habit" gets to the center of the drama: "Do you think you can live without them?" This underwrites the bi-polarities of desire that Augustine presents repeatedly throughout his early writings and in the *Confessions*. He gives up a woman's embrace to be welcomed by the chaste dignity of Continence. He manages with divine aid to overlook the allurements of his old loves and accedes to the enticements (*honeste blandiens*) of Continence (*Confessions* 8.11.27).

Ambrose could speak with aplomb on Song of Songs 3.1ff. about the soul awake at night longing for the embrace of the divine. Augustine preferred the imagery of Psalm 4, which speaks not at all about a divine embrace but about sleep as a consolation and a respite from the distress of sin and disorderliness.[35] At the same time, Augustine tries to speak of his God in a way that captures the depth of love graciously bestowed and

---

[33] Occasionally, Augustine will be forced to speak about the internal organs of the mother of Jesus, because Augustine has to defend the genuine humanity of Jesus and the real nature of the incarnation—the virginal conception and paturition—against its detractors (*De fide et symbolo* 4.10 is an example).

[34] P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* 94ff.

[35] J. J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions, vol. 3* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992) 91-92.

enjoyed, and sometimes comes close to breaching his own apparently self-imposed strictures about adopting the erotic symbolism inherent in the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs. But there is a difference.

From Origen through Ambrose and well into the middle ages any number of monastic authors made the Song of Songs the special province of their exegetical labors. Here and there questions about the propriety of the nuptial or erotic imagery come to the surface.[36] Origen had a way of dealing with the apparent difficulties surrounding what the Song of Songs self-evidently seemed to be talking about and what it took to transpose it into an allegorical frame of reference. Origen places the Song of Songs at the third level of instruction into things divine, behind Ecclesiastes and Proverbs. Adopting the three-fold division of philosophy into physics, ethics, and metaphysics, Origen divides the wisdom of Solomon into three levels corresponding to the natural, moral and the mystical.[37] For Origen, the allegorical reading of the Song is reserved for those who have advanced through the first two stages. Consequently, only a mind trained in the other disciplines of the soul, able to overlook the obviously evocative language of the Song, can transcend the primary level of the text into the deeper contemplation that yields the mystical meaning of the Song. The ascesis involved is both intellectual and moral, since it requires an effacement of the text as something other than what it appears. Whether this involved a certain amount of cognitive displacement seems altogether probable. The mystical reading of the Song of Songs as a description of the individual soul's union with God entails a preliminary "overwrite" of the text, so that in the end ascetic, mystical exegesis of the Song of Songs involves the interpretation of a palimpsest.

V. *The Psalms and Augustine's Language of Love*

The conjugal or erotic imagery that we find in Ambrose is absent in Augustine. Although the interpretative traditions Augustine inherited suggested this possibility, Augustine chose not to follow. Augustine's attitude to the Song of Songs is clearly on display in his commentary on Psalm 44 (in the Vulgate numbering).[38] Augustine's lengthy exposition of Psalm

[36] Bernard of Clairvaux draws attention to this in the first of his eighty-six sermons on the Song of Songs.

[37] Origen, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum*, Prologue 3.1. SC 375, 128-129.

[38] For another side to Augustine's differences with Ambrose which centers on Psalm 44 see David G. Hunter, The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, *Church History* 69 (2000) 281-303.

44 is almost certainly the kind of interpretation he would have proffered for the Song of Songs if he had attempted to comment fully on the Song. Among modern interpreters of the Hebrew Psalter there is near unanimous agreement that of all the Psalms it is Psalm 44 that comes closest to anything like the Song of Songs.[39] The Psalm develops the theme of a royal wedding and a sacred marriage feast. The wedding and the marriage feast are also linked to the relationship between the king and his people.

In a way Psalm 44 becomes Augustine's surrogate for the Song of Songs.[40] If there were any doubts that Augustine uses Psalm 44 as his surrogate text for the Song, he removes all such ambiguity when he quotes the entire Psalm in two parts in *De civitate Dei* 17.16 as a veritable witness to "Christ's church, wedded to so great a husband by a spiritual marriage and a divine love." In this immediate context Augustine does not mention the Song. But he doesn't have to. It is implied in the reference to the spiritual marriage of divine love between Christ and his Church, so that while Ephesians 5.23-32 provides the primary text for the entire image of Christ's marriage to his spotless bride, the Song of Song stands in the background as the "pre-text" that elicits the kind of elaboration that Augustine puts forth.

A few paragraphs later Augustine is more explicit, mentioning the Song of Songs in tones that recall the nuptial and bridal themes that often linked Ephesians 5.23-32 to the Song in the minds of many interpreters. The Song of Songs, Augustine reminds his readers,

> voices a kind of spiritual delight felt by holy minds in the marriage of the king and the queen of that city, namely, Christ and his Church. But this delight is wrapped up in allegorical draperies, so that it may be more eagerly longed for, and that its uncovering may afford more pleasure, and that the bridegroom may be revealed to whom it is said, in the same song, "Righteousness has loved you," and the bride also, who is told "Love is among your delights."[41]

---

[39] See, for example, T. H. Galder, Psalm 45, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955) 239-251; Christoph Schroeder, "'A Love Song': Psalm 45 in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Marriage Texts," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996) 417-432. And more extensively, Jan Mulder, *Studies on Psalm 45* (Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Karmel Doddendaal, 1972).

[40] For evidence of the use of Psalm 44 (45) in the wider context of the early Christian christological debates see Elisabeth Grünbeck's *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildesprache*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae XXVI. Leiden, Brill, 1994. My concerns here are much narrower.

[41] *De civitate Dei* 17.20. *St. Augustine, City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1984) 757.

Then Augustine adds that "there are many points we pass over without mention, in our anxiety to reach the end of the work" (*De civitate Dei* 17.20). Augustine here adopts one of his standard evasions, claiming to be in haste towards his intended goal. He is willing, however, to acknowledge another kind of pleasure, a "kind of delight felt by holy minds" as they contemplate the Song.

The pleasurable text stands some distance away from any intimations of the soul's nuptial embrace of God, accessible to the perception of chaste minds who are able to remove the wrapping and delve into the mysteries of the text. The delight is not a delight in the love of God as such, but in allegory, the kind of pleasurable discovery and representation spoken of in *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7. In a sense, the ecclesial reading of the Song also requires its own effacement. But it is not nearly as jarring as the re-writing of the representation of conjugal love as a nuptial union between the soul and God.

If the mitigated silence on the Song of Songs I am arguing here is valid, how does one account for Augustine's love lyricism and the various portraits of love in his works that verge on the model of spousal love? Augustine's affective language often places the desire of the soul in a larger framework that encompass other human longings. Augustine does not attempt anything like an idealization of conjugal or erotic love. And so he does not present spousal love as an analogue of divine love, though he does allude to erotic, physical love as a way of understanding the nature of true desire.[42]

The parallelism between Augustine's errant loves and the love of God appear often enough in such striking language in the *Confessions* that one can easily misconstrue his intentions. In one instance, while discounting the relevance of any such analogy between the love of things beautiful, sweet, fragrant, pleasurable and the like, Augustine finds himself straining to describe the love of God in ways that build on precisely these approximate images of true beauty. He speaks of the love of God as "a kind of embrace," an embrace at once peculiar and allusively nuptial. But, set in the midst of other sensory images, the representation of the love of God as an embrace of Augustine's inner self suggests that the nuptial imagery may not be the most apposite. And all the more so when he describes his love of God as

> a light, voice, food, embrace of my inner self, where my soul is floodlit by light which space cannot contain, where there is sound that time cannot seize,

[42] See, for example, *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 26.4.

> where there is a perfume which no breeze disperses, where there is a taste for food no amount of wanting can lessen, and where there is a bond of union that no satiety can part. This is what I love when I love my God.[43]

If this were not enough, Augustine presents the sheer luminosity of the divine presence by speaking of the fire that consumes, fire that sets him ablaze, setting all this once again in the context of the five primary senses. Captured as part of his sense of late joy, Augustine's representations allude to images of Wisdom in Proverbs 2-8; of thirsting in Psalm 41; and possibly of the lover and the beloved in the Song of Songs.

> You were with me, and I was not with you. The lovely things kept me far from you, though if they did not have their existence in you, they had no existence at all. You called and cried out loud and shattered my deafness. You were radiant and resplendent, you put to flight my blindness, You were fragrant, and I drew in my breadth and now pant after you. You touched me, and I am set on fire to attain the peace which is yours.[44]

The fusion of these disparate themes and images does not disrupt the consistent use of tactile language along the same lines in which Augustine employs the idea of an embrace.

Augustine recognizes in the many disparate forms of human longing what it is to love God.

> For with you is the fountain of life and in your light we shall see light. Give me one who loves, and he feels what I am saying. Give me one who desires, give me one who hungers, give me one traveling and thirsting in this solitude and sighing for the fountain of an eternal homeland, give me such a one, and he knows what I am saying. But if I speak to someone cold and unresponsive, he knows not what I speak.[45]

The embrace does not stand as the primary image through which Augustine speaks of the soul's longing. If anything, he goes out of his way to make sure that his language employs images of all the primary senses in an attempt to situate his language about longing in a broader framework.

And yet it is the language of being inflamed that sets Augustine's sensibilities in its characteristic hue, denoting the cauterizing effect of the chastening love of God. Augustine describes this ardent love as one of

---

[43] *Confessiones* 10.6.8. *Saint Augustine: Confessions,* trans. Henry Chadwick 183.

[44] *Confessiones* 10.27.38. Ibid., 201.

[45] *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 26.4.3. FC 78, 263. Augustine has the same idea in *De libero arbitrio* 2.13.

certainty and not of vague feeling (*non dubia, sed certa*). The language appears early in Augustine's *Contra Academicos*. So what we find in the *Confessions* is a well-established sensibility that lends an impassioned tone to Augustine's intellectual efforts.

Fire tends to move upwards, Augustine states in *Confessions* 13.9.10. In a world of oiled lamps, where the flame ushers in the light that preempts the darkness of night, the corresponding images of light and fire are inseparable. Augustine sees in the upward movement of fire, some intimation of the ascent to which he believes the soul is called, an ascent that reaches its fulfillment because inspired and inflamed by a greater flame: that is, God of God, Light from Light.

Cognizant of how much his own approach to the soul's ascent to God has moved away from Neoplatonic sensibilities, Augustine describes the ascent as the journey to Jerusalem.

> My weight is my love. Wherever I am carried, my love is carrying me. By your gift we are set on fire and carried upwards: we grow red hot and ascend. We climb "the ascents in our heart," and sing the "song of steps." Lit by your fire, your good fire, we grow red-hot and ascend, as we move upwards "to the peace of Jerusalem." For I was glad when they said to me, let us go to the house of the Lord. There we will be brought to our place by a good will, so that we want nothing but to stay there for ever.[46]

Augustine's ascent is in keeping with the earthly pilgrimage of the City of God as it journeys towards the heavenly Jerusalem. "Love lifts us there, and your good Spirit exalts our humble estate from the gates of death" (*Confessions* 13.9.10).

Singing the songs of ascent allows Augustine to capture his longing in the language of desire found in the Psalms: desire (*desiderium*) without eros, love (*caritas, amor, delectio*) without self-possessiveness (*cupiditas*). To paraphrase Augustine's words about using what little talents he has in order that he might not lose them (*De doctrina christiana* 1.1): the love of God is not properly possessed if it is not shared, since it does not decrease in being the common possession of many. This social idea of love is central to Augustine's conception of divine love and how it is appropriated and experienced by human beings. This, I suggest, is part of the reason that Augustine does not adopt conjugal love as a fitting metaphor for describing the love of God and the soul. Conjugal love remains fundamentally exclusionary, whereas the love of God is be shared with others.

---

[46] *Confessiones* 13.9.10. *Saint Augustine: Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick 278-279.

In one of his late homilies, Sermon 34, we find Augustine appealing to erotic love, in his attempt to make poignant for his listeners the exceptional character and object of desiring and loving God. Augustine appeals in part to his listeners' modesty. He also seems to ask permission for the audacity it requires to venture even such a comparison or analogy. Augustine begins: "At the risk of shocking your charity, I am going to say (*Audeo dicere caritati uestrae*), 'let us observe at the lower level what we may expect to find at the higher level.' The lowest kind of earthly love, the sordid love which sets its sights on bodily charms, can teach us something useful which we can apply at the higher and purer level."[47] This is as far as Augustine goes, that physical love can teach us something useful. But beyond that it can do no better. Augustine's comments in Sermon 34 are a far cry from Ambrose's appropriation of the erotic imagery of the Song of Songs. As Augustine decries the sordid nature of bodily love (and by extension conjugal love), he underscores how inadequate it is to attempt to capture the nature of divine love through the language and symbolism of erotic love. The risk of shocking "your love," the audacity Augustine mentions, represents Augustine's own sense of impropriety in using this "muddy kind of lust" (*ista lutulenta cupiditate*) to speak of the most radiant kind of love (*illuminatissima caritate*), namely the love of God.[48]

Augustine's studied indifference to employing the conjugal and erotic imagery of the Song of Songs suggests a critical stance towards the early Christian tradition of reading the Song as an allegorical rendition of the soul's "conjugal" embrace of the divine. At the very least, Augustine demonstrates that an affective spirituality of the soul's ascent to God does not need the Song of Songs to underwrite its language of love.

Villanova University, Dept. of Core Humanities
800 Lancester Avenue
Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085-1699

[47] *Sermo* 34.4 (CCSL 41, 425). *Augustine. Sermons III/1. The Works of St. Augustine. A New Translation for the 21st Century*, trans. Edmund Hill (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press, 1990) 167.

[48] *Sermo* 34.5 (CCSL 41, 425).

ERZÄHLER UND CHARAKTER ZUGLEICH.
ZUR LITERARISCHEN FUNKTION DES „PETRUS" IN DEM NACH IHM BENANNTEN EVANGELIENFRAGMENT

VON

TOBIAS NICKLAS

Unter den vier Hauptunterschieden, welche T. Zahn zwischen dem am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts aufgeregt diskutierten „Petrusevangelium" (= PE)[1] und den vier kanonischen Evangelien auflistet, nennt er als erstes die eigentümliche Tatsache, dass der Erzähler des erstgenannten Textes mit seinem „Ich" hervortritt und dass dieses „Ich" sich selbst als Simon Petrus identifiziert sowie Andreas seinen Bruder nennt.[2] So klar ersichtlich dies ist, so sehr verwundert, dass die sich hieraus ergebende literarische Problematik m.W. noch nie genauer unter die Lupe genommen wurde: „Petrus"[3] als Charakter agiert ja auf einer anderen Ebene von Kommunikation und besitzt eine andere Perspektive[4] auf die erzählte Welt als der Erzähler

[1] Gefunden wurde, um genau zu sein, natürlich nicht das „Petrusevangelium", sondern die heute ins 6. Jahrhundert datierte Pergamenthandschrift PCair 10759, die aber gerade aufgrund der Tatsache, dass Petrus hier als Erzähler auftritt, mit dem bei Serapion von Antiochien (Euseb, *h.e.* VI 12,3-6) erwähnten „Evangelium nach Petrus" identifiziert wurde. Zur Datierung, vgl. G. Cavallo & H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300-800* (BIC.S 47; London 1987) 90.

[2] Vgl. T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Petrus. Das kürzlich gefundene Fragment seines Textes* (Erlangen-Leipzig 1893) 16-17.

[3] Die Tatsache, dass die literarische Figur „Petrus" weder auf der Ebene der Charaktere der erzählten Welt noch gar auf der des Erzählers einfach mit dem historischen Petrus ineinsgesetzt werden kann, braucht nicht besonders hervorgehoben zu werden.

[4] Der Begriff „Perspektive" bzw. „Point of View" wird in erster Linie auf der Ebene des Erzählers und seines Gegenübers gebraucht. R. Alter, *The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age* (New York u.a. 1989) 172, beschreibt den „Point of View" einer Erzählung als „particular angle from which we are invited by the nature of the narration to imagine the narrated personages, places and events." Eine griffige Definition im Hinblick auf biblische Erzählungen gibt auch J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie, Bd. 2: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis* (WUNT 117; Tübingen 1998) 160-161. Diese Perspektive lässt sich

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 318-326

„Petrus".[5] Wie hat der Autor des PE diese beiden Dimensionen verknüpft? Diese Frage ist aber nicht nur an sich interessant: Wichtiger ist, dass sie auch Licht auf die literarischen Fähigkeiten[6] und Aussageintentionen des Verfassers dieses apokryphen Textes wirft.[7]

1. *„Petrus" als Charakter der erzählten Welt*

Nur an zwei Stellen tritt „Petrus" als Charakter der erzählten Welt in Erscheinung. Dies sind die VV. 26-27 sowie 59-60, wo der überlieferte Bestand der Erzählung unvermittelt abbricht.

---

dann mit B. Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1973) 6, in die Ebenen des „ideological" (evaluativ), „phraseological" (spielt in biblischer und verwandter Erzählung keine Rolle), „spatial" (räumlich), „temporal" (zeitlich) und „psychological" (bezogen auf die Innensicht der Charaktere) Point of View einteilen. Doch nicht nur der Erzähler, auch die Charaktere besitzen eine Perspektive auf die erzählte Welt: So sind sie an die erzählte Zeit gebunden, an die Orte der erzählten Szenen. Nur partiell ist ihnen Einsicht in das Innere der Mitakteure gegeben, und auch ihre evaluative Perspektive muss sich nicht mit der des Erzählers decken. Vgl. hierzu M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington 1985) 172: „The 'characters perspective' differs from all the others . . . in its multiplicity. And it is their divergence—in interest, interpretation, world view, scenario, hope and fear—that keeps the action going, just as their convergence makes for its resolution. . . . What such diverse figural perspectives have in common is the inherent limitation of knowledge and liability to misjudgment, which motivates the progress of the tale."

[5] Zum vorausgesetzten Kommunikationsmodell narrativer Kritik, vgl. z.B. die übersichtliche Darstellung von S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca-London 1978) 267. Eine kurze methodische Zusammenfassung mit Definition der Begriffe „impliziter Autor", „impliziter Leser", „Erzähler", „Gegenüber", „Charakter" der erzählten Welt bietet auch M.A. Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis 1990) 19-21.

[6] Eine pauschale Abwertung des literarischen Wertes neutestamentlicher Apokryphen, wie sie v.a. bei M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses* (Oxford 1924 (ND 1972)) xiii, begegnet, dürfte m.E. eher den Blick auf mögliche Entdeckungen verstellen als weiterführen.

[7] Klargestellt sei, dass natürlich die Ergebnisse einer derartigen Untersuchung aufgrund einerseits des nur fragmentarischen Erhaltungszustandes des PE, andererseits auch wegen der großen Unsicherheiten über die textliche Qualität des einzigen für eine Auslegung infrage kommenden Fragments selbst in gewisser Weise fragmentarisch bleiben müssen.

1.1. *VV. 26-27*

Diese erste Stelle, an der „Petrus" noch—zumindest aus der Abfolge des erhaltenen Fragments heraus—verhüllt in der Ich-Form spricht, wirkt wie eine unvermittelte Einblendung in die Schilderung der dramatischen Ereignisse um den Tod Jesu. Dafür sprechen nicht nur der abrupte Ortswechsel und die plötzliche Einführung von Personen, die zumindest in den erhaltenen Versen des überlieferten Fragments noch keine Rolle spielten, sondern vor allem auch die Tatsache, dass von keiner Interaktion zwischen den „Jüngern" und den weiteren Akteuren der Erzählung die Rede sein kann. Zwar suchen die „Juden" die „Jünger" als κακοῦργοι, diese Notiz dient aber zunächst zur Begründung (γάρ) der Tatsache, dass diese sich verstecken (ἐκρυβόμεθα). „Petrus" ist also hier ein Teil der „Jünger", die insgesamt eine Einheit, also eigentlich nur *einen* Charakter, bilden. Dieser ist wie in einer Nussschale von den übrigen Ereignissen abgeschnitten, am Geschehen um die Kreuzigung und das Begräbnis des „Herrn" nicht *beteiligt*, er nimmt aber regen *Anteil* daran. In dieser Reaktion auf den Tod Jesu werden die „Jünger" gleichzeitig mit den „Juden", deren Handeln (VV. 25.28) geradezu einen Rahmen um VV. 26-27 bildet, kontrastiert.

Was lässt sich aus den wenigen Angaben des Textes über die Perspektive des Charakters „Petrus" bzw. „Jünger" auf die erzählte Welt folgern? Nicht ganz eindeutig zu ermitteln ist bereits die räumliche Perspektive. Dies liegt zum Teil daran, dass die VV. 25-26 zwar eine Trennung von den „Juden" voraussetzen, aber kein konkreter Ort genannt ist, an dem sich die „Jünger" verstecken. Gleichzeitig verhindert die Bindung an diesen Ort, dass sie zu Zeugen der ab V. 34 erzählten Auferstehungsereignisse werden. Aufschlussreich in mehrerlei Hinsicht ist auch die wiederholte Betonung der Trauer der Jünger (ἐλυπούμην, ἐκαθεζόμεθα πενθοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες):[8] Diese macht einerseits klar, dass sie um die *an anderem Orte* stattfindenden Ereignisse um Jesus Bescheid wissen.[9] Andererseits aber gibt sie auch Aufschluss über die *zeitliche Begrenzung* des Jüngerperspektive: Durch ihre Trauer wird deutlich, dass ihnen die *nachfolgenden* Ereignisse der Auferstehung Jesu zum Zeitpunkt des Trauerns noch nicht bekannt sind. Gemeinsam mit

---

[8] Zur Schilderung der Traurigkeit der „Jünger", vgl. L. Vaganay, *L'Évangile de Pierre* (ÉtB; Paris 1930) 273.337.

[9] Die Tatsache, dass sich die Trauer auf den Tod Jesu bezieht, ist zwar nicht explizit genannt. Der Kontext ist hier aber so eindeutig, dass diese „Leerstelle" leicht vom Leser gefüllt werden kann.

den Angaben über das „Fasten“[10] hat die Erwähnung der Trauer natürlich aber vor allem die Funktion Einblick in die evaluative Perspektive der Jünger zu geben: Sie missbilligen das an ihrem „Herrn“ Geschehene zutiefst und sind verzweifelt über die Situation, nicht eingreifen zu können.

Nur wenig lässt sich schließlich aus den sparsamen Angaben des Textes über die psychologische Perspektive der „Jünger“ auf die Ereignisse der erzählten Welt sagen. Zumindest aber die Tatsache, dass die Flucht ins Versteck mit einer Aktion der „Juden“ begründet wird, zeigt an, dass die „Jünger“ über deren Pläne informiert sind, während den „Juden“ ihr Versteck nicht zugänglich zu sein scheint.

1.2. *VV. 59-60*

Auch die zweite Szene, in der „Petrus“ direkt zur Sprache kommt, VV. 59-60, erweist sich als deutlich vom Kontext abgegrenzt. Das „Wir“ der Jünger stellt sich den Vielen aus V. 58 gegenüber, die alle in ihre Häuser zurückkehren. Auch hier findet keine Interaktion zwischen den „Jüngern“ und anderen Personen statt. Im Gegensatz zu VV. 25f. setzt sich in V. 60 „Simon Petrus“ von der zunächst wiederum als Einheit betrachteten Gruppe der „Zwölf“ ab.[11] Doch bilden, soweit der fragmentarische Zustand des überlieferten Textes Schlüsse zulässt, die „Jünger“ wiederum eine in sich geschlossene, ja geradezu erzählerisch eingekapselte Gruppe, die vom vorangegangenen Geschehen abgeschnitten scheint.

Was Raum und Zeit angeht, sind die „Jünger“ natürlich wieder an die Ordnung der erzählten Welt gebunden. Jeder geht—analog zu den heimkehrenden Festgästen—εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.[12] Erstaunlich aber ist vor allem die Tatsache, dass sie noch immer „weinen und trauern“: Dies heißt ja, dass sie von den bereits geschehenen Ereignissen um die Auferweckung des „Herrn“ noch nichts wissen können, ja dass nicht einmal die in VV.

---

[10] Zu dieser Thematik, vgl. M.G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre* (SC 201; Paris 1973) 157-159.

[11] Spekulationen um die Frage, ob sich aus der Erwähnung der Zwölfzahl schließen ließe, das PE habe den Verrat des Judas nicht gekannt, führen m.E. hier nicht weiter. Eher ist wohl daran zu denken, dass der Autor hier die traditionelle „Zwölf“ voraussetzt ohne über das angesprochene Problem zu reflektieren. Auch 1Kor 15,5 spricht ja von den „Zwölf“ ohne Folgerungen auf Traditionen über Judas Iskariot sinnvoll zu machen.

[12] Wo dieser οἶκος ist, lässt sich aus den Angaben des Fragments aber nicht entnehmen.

50-57 erzählte Grabesgeschichte um „Maria von Magdala und ihre Freundinnen" ihre Perspektive verändert hat.[13] Dieser Eindruck wird weiter verstärkt durch die Erwähnung der Tatsache, dass Petrus und Andreas ihre Netze nehmen und zum „Meer"[14] gehen, also wohl ihre frühere Tätigkeit wiederaufnehmen wollen. Bevor aber eine Fortführung der Erzählung weitergehende Folgerungen erlauben würde, bricht das erhaltene Fragment mitten im Satz ab.

2. *Der Erzähler des PE und seine Perspektive*

Während der Charakter „Petrus" an Raum und Zeit der erzählten Welt gebunden ist, gilt dies keineswegs für den ja dauernd anwesenden „Erzähler"[15] der Geschichte, der sich nur an wenigen Stellen als „Petrus" zu erkennen gibt. Besonders deutlich wird dies in der Dimension des Räumlichen:

(1) In den VV. 1-5 wechselt der Fokus des Erzählten mehrfach zwischen „Herodes" und „Pilatus". Dies ist umso erstaunlicher, als sich diese ab V. 3 an unterschiedlichen, wenn auch nicht näher bezeichneten Orten aufhalten.

(2) Obwohl der Charakter „Petrus" sich im Versteck aufhält (VV. 26-27), werden die Verspottung (VV. 6-9) und die Ereignisse der Kreuzigung sowie des Todes Jesu (VV. 10-23) erzählt. Daran ist besonders erstaunlich, dass der Erzähler von einer Finsternis zu berichten weiß, die „ganz Judäa" bedeckt (V. 15b: καὶ σκότος κατέσχε πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν), sowie von einem Beben der „ganzen Erde" (V. 21b: καὶ ἡ γῆ πᾶσα ἐσείσθη).

(3) Breiten Raum gibt der Erzähler auch der Schilderung der Ereignisse in der Nacht zum „Herrentag", die dem Charakter „Petrus" offensichtlich verborgen sind.

(4) Vor diesem Hintergrund überrascht es nicht, dass wir den Erzähler auch an der Seite der Schriftgelehrten, Pharisäer und Ältesten (V. 28) finden, dass er berichtet, dass gleichzeitig (αὐτῆς ὥρας) mit dem Tode Jesu der Vorhang des Tempels zerreißt usw.

Die *zeitliche Perspektive* des Erzählers erweist sich nicht nur aus der Schilderung der Ereignisse um Jesu Auferstehung als *nachösterlich.* Bereits V. 3 mit seiner Vorwegnahme des Todes Jesu spricht dafür, dass der

---

[13] Vgl. ähnlich Vaganay, *Pierre*, 331.

[14] Dass hier das „Meer von Galiläa" bzw. der „See Gennesaret" gemeint sein könnte, lässt sich aus dem Kontext des Fragments nicht erweisen.

[15] Zur literaturwissenschaftlichen Kategorie des Erzählers, angewandt auf biblische Literatur, vgl. z.B. J. Staley, *The Print's First Kiss. A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBL.DS 82; Atlanta 1988) 37-38.

Erzähler von seinem zeitlichen Standpunkt aus mehr weiß, als der Verlauf der Handlung verrät. Für diese Beobachtung lassen sich aber nicht nur zeitliche Angaben oder Vorwegnahmen kommender Ereignisse deuten, vor allem sprechen die christologischen Aussagen, die der Erzähler schon *vor* dem Tode Jesu mit diesem verbindet, dafür, dass die Jesusgestalt schon als eine in ihrer *Bedeutung gedeutete* vorausgesetzt ist:[16] Genannt sei z.B. der Titel Κύριος, der den „Jesus"-Namen praktisch völlig ersetzt, die Bezeichnung Jesu als „Sohn Gottes" (VV. 6.9.45.46), „König Israels" (VV. 7.10) sowie die Deutung als σωτὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (V. 13) im Munde des κακοῦργος am Kreuz.

Vielleicht lässt sich die zeitliche Perspektive des Erzählers aber noch ein wenig mehr präzisieren: So spricht V. 25 von κρίσις und τέλος Jerusalems. Mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit ist hier auf die—aus Sicht des Erzählers bereits zurückliegenden—Ereignisse der Zerstörung der Stadt im Jahre 70 angespielt. Dafür spricht wohl auch die eigenartige Notiz (V. 26), dass die „Jünger" gesucht würden, weil sie angeblich planten den Tempel anzuzünden. Diese erklärt sich m.E. am besten als Seitenhieb gegen die „Juden", die das drohende Ende Jerusalems zwar richtig mit der Verbrennung des Tempels in Verbindung bringen, fälschlicherweise aber den „Jüngern" die Schuld dafür zuschieben wollen:[17] Eine solche Bemerkung gewinnt aber erst aus einer Sicht nach den Ereignissen des Jüdischen Krieges ihre eigentliche Schärfe.

Auch die *psychologische Perspektive* des Erzählers geht weit über die des Charakters „Petrus" hinaus. An mehreren Stellen zeigt er, dass er innere Regungen oder Gefühle der von ihm gezeichneten Charaktere kennt: So erwähnt er das Wissen des „Josef" (V. 3) über den kommenden Tod Jesu oder die Furcht der „Frauen" am Grab (VV. 50.57). Besonders häufig aber zeichnet der Innenansichten der „Juden": Er kennt ihre Aufregung und Angst wegen der Finsternis über Judäa (V. 15), die Meinung mancher, es

---

[16] Zur Christologie des PE vgl. z.B. P.M. Head, On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 209-224, und J.W. McCant, The Gospel of Peter. Docetism Reconsidered, *NTS* 30 (1984) 258-273. Nicht eingegangen werden soll in diesem Zusammenhang auf die vor allem auf das Serapion-Zeugnis zurückzuführende Frage, inwieweit sich die Christologie des PE als „doketisch" oder zumindest „doketisch beeinflusst" erweist. Vgl. z.B. N. Brox, 'Doketismus'—eine Problemanzeige, *ZKG* 95 (1984) 301-314, der zu Recht vor einem naiven Umgang mit diesen Begriffen warnt.

[17] Vgl. ähnlich Mara, *Pierre*, 156. Auch die Bemerkung die Jünger seien τετρωμένοι κατὰ διάνοιαν gewesen, könnte mit ihrem möglichen Bezug auf 2Makk 3,16f. in diese Richtung weisen.

sei Nacht (V. 18), ihre Furcht wegen des Erdbebens (V. 21) oder die Freude nach dem Wiedererscheinen der Sonne (V. 23). Vor dem Innenleben *eines* Charakters aber macht die Erzählung zumindest im überlieferten Fragment Halt:[18] Dies ist Jesus, der „Herr",[19] der geheimnisvoll und undurchsichtig—und damit dem Erzähler überlegen—bleibt: In gewisser Weise scheint er—bis auf den Aufschrei in V. 19—vom Geschehen um ihn völlig unberührt.

Schließlich bleibt noch die Aufgabe einer Analyse der *evaluativen Perspektive* des Erzählers. Zumindest an zwei Aspekten kann gezeigt werden, dass gerade in dieser Dimension der Charakter „Petrus" und der Erzähler wenigstens ansatzweise konvergieren:

(1) Was der Erzähler vom Verhalten der „Juden" Jesus gegenüber denkt, macht er in V. 17 explizit: καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν πάντα καὶ ἐτελείωσαν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.[20] Das Verhalten der „Juden" wird also als „Erfüllung" der Schrift gedeutet.[21] Gleichzeitig machen diese damit das Maß ihrer Sünden voll. Zumindest der letzte Aspekt könnte sich auch im Verhalten der Jünger—und damit des Petrus—zeigen: Wie oben bereits angedeutet wurde, darf dies zumindest als Zeichen der Missbilligung des Verhaltens der „Juden" gegenüber Jesus gedeutet werden.

(2) Die wenigen Angaben in VV. 26f. und 59f. lassen zwar keine Schlüsse zu, welche genaue Sicht der Charakter „Petrus" von Jesus hat: Sieht er in ihm schon den „Herrn", den „Sohn Gottes", als den ihn der Erzähler direkt und indirekt bezeichnet? Die Zuordnung des Petrus zu den Zwölf

---

[18] Natürlich wird auch über die beiden Übeltäter am Kreuz nichts gesagt. Zumindest das Denken dessen, der in V. 13 spricht, lässt sich bereits aus seinen Worten entnehmen. Eine weitere Zeichnung innerer Regungen ist hier ebensowenig notwendig wie z.B. bei „Pilatus", dessen „Sicht der Dinge" sich ebenfalls aus seinem Handeln folgern lässt.

[19] Die umstrittene Bemerkung, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐσιώπα ὡς μηδένα πόνον ἔχων (V. 10b) ist wohl philologisch zweideutig, der Kontext aber lässt eine kausale Interpretation von ὡς nicht zu. Eher ist daran zu denken, dass hier wie in frühchristlichen Märtyrerberichten (vgl. z.B. MartPol 8,3) das heldenhafte Überwinden des Schmerzes thematisiert ist. Vgl. hierzu auch J.D. Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke. The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco u.a. 1988) 180; Head, Christology, 212-213; McCant, Gospel, 261-262.

[20] D. Lührmann, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (MThSt 59; Marburg, 2000) 87, gibt hier folgende Textform: [καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν πάν]τα. Eine Neuuntersuchung des Manuskripts PCair 10759 ergab aber, dass der Text hier vollständig lesbar ist.

[21] Zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des PE, vgl. v.a. J. Denker, *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Doketismus* (EHS XXIII.36; Bern-Frankfurt am Main 1975) 58-77.

bzw. den Gefährten wie auch die gegen die „Jünger" gerichtete Verfolgungsaktion der „Juden" macht aber deutlich, dass er zumindest eine hohe Meinung von Jesus hat, dieser den zentralen Bezugspunkt seines Lebens bildet.

3. *Fazit*

Zumindest für das überlieferte Fragment des PE lässt sich eine Abkapselung des Charakters „Petrus" bzw. der „Jünger" von den Ereignissen um den Tod Jesu, die hauptsächlich von den „Juden" getragen werden, beobachten: Wie „Jesus" nehmen sie eigentlich nicht am Geschehen teil und treten in keinerlei Dialog mit den anderen Akteuren der erzählten Welt.[22] Dass sie von den „Juden" als Verbrecher gesucht werden, stellt eine weitere Parallele zum Charakter „Jesus" her. Als nicht unmittelbar Involvierte, trotzdem aber Betroffene, rücken die Jünger in eine eigenartige „Zuschauer"-Rolle:[23] Zwar sind sie räumlich getrennt von den Ereignissen um den Tod Jesu, ihre Trauer verrät aber, dass sie doch wissen, was geschieht. Als Verfolgte sind sie zur selben Passivität wie Jesus gezwungen, in ihrer Trauer und ihrem Fasten tun sie das einzige, was ihnen möglich ist.

Bei allen Einschränkungen in der Perspektive der Charaktere „Jünger" bzw. „Petrus" besteht aber zumindest grundlegende Kontinuität zwischen ihrer evaluativen Perspektive und der des *nahezu* allwissend auftretenden Erzählers. Woher dieser sein Wissen, welches ja weit über das des *Charakters* „Petrus" hinausgeht, bezieht, wird zumindest im erhaltenen Fragment nicht thematisiert.[24] Dieses Zueinander von Erzähler und Charakter „Petrus" wirkt sich nun in komplementärer Weise aus: Einerseits ist das grundsätzliche Vertrauen, welches der Leser eines narrativen Textes dessen Erzähler entgegenbringt, zu bedenken:[25] Die Identifikation des Erzählers mit dem

---

[22] Die Tatsache, dass Jesus in dem erhaltenen Rest der Passion in keinerlei Beziehung zu seinen Richtern oder den „Juden" tritt, hat auch K. Beyschlag, *Die verborgene Überlieferung von Christus* (München-Hamburg 1969) 37, betont: „Jesus hat mit diesen Gottlosen um sich herum eben nicht das Geringste zu schaffen."

[23] Natürlich sind die „Jünger" nicht als Zuschauer der Ereignisse unter dem Kreuz geschildert. Die beobachtete eigentümliche Zwitterstellung zwischen ihrer räumlichen Abwesenheit, aber ihrem gleichzeitigen Wissen um den Tod Jesu, das sich ja in ihrer Trauer offenbart, lässt jedoch m.E. den Begriff „Zuschauer" zumindest im übertragenen Sinne zu.

[24] Sicher spielt dabei die im Fragment wohl *noch* nicht erzählte, aber zu erwartende Erfahrung des Auferstandenen—in welcher Form auch immer—eine Rolle.

[25] Vgl. hierzu Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 227.

Charakter „Petrus" *stiftet* somit Autorität, indem sie diesen Charakter zum Letztgültiges aussprechenden Interpreten und Zeugen der Ereignisse um die Passion Jesu[26] hochstilisiert. Andererseits setzt die Tatsache, dass als Erzähler ausgerechnet „Petrus" gewählt wird, natürlich bereits eine gewisse Autorität und damit Wirkungsgeschichte des *historischen* Petrus voraus. Diese macht sich der Verfasser des Textes zunutze: Indem er seinen „Erzähler" mit Petrus identifiziert, unterstützt er auch dessen gegenüber dem Leser überlegene Stellung. Der Kreislauf der Wechselwirkungen kann beginnen. Dieses Spiel birgt aber eine Gefahr: Wo der Anspruch des Erzählers als „historischer" Petrus zu sprechen als falsch entlarvt wird, zersetzt diese Erkenntnis auch das Vertrauen in den Anspruch des Erzählers letztgültige Interpretation des „Herrn" zu liefern. Dieser auf *narrativer* Ebene als bedeutsam erwiesene Vorgang ist *geschichtlich* erstmals sicher bei Serapion von Antiochien (Eusebius, *h.e.* VI 12,3) greifbar, wenn dieser einen wie auch immer zu bestimmenden „doketischen" und damit nicht-petrinischen Ursprung des PE bezeugt[27]—und es deswegen ablehnt.

Universität Regensburg
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät
D-93040 *Regensburg* BRD

[26] Die Wendung „Passion Jesu" ist natürlich aus dem Grunde gewählt, weil wir aus den erhaltenen Fragmenten nicht schließen können, was das PE außerdem noch erzählte.

[27] Zum Zeugnis des Serapion, vgl. v.a. die instruktive Untersuchung von E. Junod, Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d'Antioche et l'Évangile de Pierre. D'un évangile à un pseudépigraphe, *RSLR* 24 (1988), 3-16; bzw. Ibid., Comment l'*Évangile de Pierre* s'est trouvé écarté des lectures de l'Église dans les années 200, *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue* (Hg. J.-D. Kaestli & D. Marguerat; Essais Bibliques 26; Genf 1995) 43-46.

REVIEWS

Samuel Fernández, *Cristo Médico, según Orígenes. La actividad médica como metáfora de la acción divina.* Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 64. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum 1999. 327 pages. ISBN 88-7961-033-3. Price 65000 Lire.

This monograph represents the doctoral dissertation of a young Chilean scholar, prepared at the Augustinianum in Rome under the supervision of Professor Manlio Simonetti. Specialists in the thought of Origen will certainly be interested in it, because it is the first systematic treatment on this scale of the metaphor of illness and healing so pervasive in the Alexandrian's writings. The book is divided into four parts. The first introduces the necessary background, both in the philosophical and the biblical tradition. The author then studies his theme from the viewpoint of the illness (Part 2), the patient (Part 3) and the doctor (Part 4). These three parts correspond exactly to the three aspects of the practice of medicine, as defined in the Hippocratic corpus (*Epid.* 1.2.5). The last-mentioned part is again divided into two, first expounding the role of God as doctor and then that of Christ as doctor. In these three parts an exhaustive analysis is given of the numerous texts scattered throughout the *corpus Origenianum* in which the metaphor of illness and healing is employed.

The author is very conscious of the importance of methodological and hermeneutical considerations. He is convinced that Origen is above all an exegete, and that the use of the metaphor of illness and healing is generally prompted by the motive of biblical exposition. In this context he made an interesting discovery, namely that the theme of Christ the doctor is almost always prompted by accounts and pronouncements in the Gospels, but that this is not the case for the theme of God the doctor, which is usually occasioned by more general discussions of a theological nature. This particular theme, it emerges, is particularly suited for discussions of divine providence and the divine economy of salvation, which for Origen is inseparably connected to questions of human free will and divine action. Fernández concludes that it gives us valuable insights into the two doctrines that constitute Origen's hermeneutic *Vorverständnis*, namely the doctrine of divine goodness and the doctrine of the free human will. It will be plain from

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

the above summary that this book will be of value not only for Origen specialists, but also for all those who are interested in central dogmas of early Christian theology.

University of Leiden DAVID T. RUNIA

David Frankfurter, *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (Religions in the Greco-Roman World 134). Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1998, xiv + 516 pp. + 4 diagrams & 7 plates, ISBN 90-04-11127-1, DFL 276 / $ 162,50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Die 14 Beiträge verschiedener Autoren behandeln nicht nur das spätantike Ägypten, sondern reichen zeitlich von der pharaonischen bis in die byzantinische Epoche und räumlich bis in den Nahen Osten. In den fünf Teilen des Buches werden historische, religionswissenschaftliche und literarische Themen erörtert, aber auch archäologische Beschreibungen von Pilgerheiligtümern gegeben.

Der Herausgeber erläutert in der Einleitung, die den ersten Teil des Buches bildet, daß die ägyptisch-christlichen Traditionen als Beispiel für das Gesamtphänomen der Wallfahrt in der Religionsgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes betrachtet werden sollen. Das Phänomen gibt aber gleichzeitig Aufschluß über das Christentum selbst: „And since the growth of Christian pilgrimage is inextricably connected to the phenomenon and process of Christianization itself, the larger topic to which this volume pertains is not pilgrimage *per se* – as a human ideal – but rather the nature of Christianization as it plants itself in the landscape with pilgrimage shrines." (S. 6). Weiter werden Fragen nach den Motiven für Wallfahrten und den Gründen für unterschiedliche – regionale oder überregionale – Einzugsgebiete der Kulte erörtet. Die weitreichende soziale und politische Bedeutung, die heilige Bezirke besaßen, wird allein dadurch deutlich, daß durch neu geschaffene Märtyrerstätten, übernommene Kultkomplexe oder mit Legenden bedachte Stätten (Reise der hl. Familie) gleichzeitig das Renommee von Orten gefördert wurde.

Im zweiten Teil des Buches über einheimische Traditionen werden von Y. Volokhine in "Les déplacements pieux en Égypte pharaonique: sites et pratiques cultuelles" Kultstätten aus dynastischer Zeit vorgestellt, unter denen einige Zentren mit überregionaler Bedeutung wie der Bereich von Memphis oder Abydos besondere Beachtung erfahren. Pilgerreisen im engeren Sinne, die ein Individuum aus religiöser Motivation aus einer lokalen Ära hinaus-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

führen, besitzen keine Bedeutung, da die Ortskulte eine wichtigere Rolle spielten. Hingegen lassen sich viele christlich-religiöse Verhaltensweisen, wie die Frömmigkeit am Grabe einer verehrungswürdigen Person oder die Inkubation, auf alte Traditionen zurückführen. A. Kerkeslager geht in "Jewish Pilgrimage and Jewish Identity in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt" schwerpunktmäßig auf die Frage nach der jüdischen Identität im griechisch-römischen Ägypten und ihrem Ausdruck im Pilgertum ein. Die beschriebenen jüdischen Traditionen (Pilgerreisen nach Jerusalem, Totenkult etc.) werden als mögliche Vorläufer für die christliche Wallfahrt eher negativ bewertet – bei der Formulierung der Ergebnisse werden Ähnlichkeiten hinter den Unterschieden zurückgesetzt. In einem sehr langen Teil des Artikels (S. 146–213) wird die Lokalisierung des Berges Sinai in verschiedenen jüdischen Quellen, beginnend mit der vorexilischen Periode, diskutiert.

Der dritte Teil des Buches bietet sechs Beiträge zu regionalen Pilgerstätten mit deutlichem Schwerpunkt im spätantiken Ägypten. Dabei thematisiert der Artikel "Island of the Extremity: Space, Language, and Power in the Pilgrimage Traditions of Philae" von I. Rutherford zu einem großen Teil noch die im vorigen Teil behandelten vorchristlichen Traditionen. Mit einem Hinweis auf die Interpretationsprobleme, die die Inschriften bieten (Unterscheidung von Pilgern oder Gelegenheitsbesuchern), wird über die Geschichte des Tempelkomplexes seit den Anfängen in der 25. Dynastie (die Isis-Verehrung begann unter Psammetich II. in der 26. Dynastie) referiert. Der geschichtliche Überblick, in dem auch die Grenzverschiebungen in römischer Zeit sowie die Rolle der Blemmyer und Nobaden behandelt werden, endet mit der Schließung des Isistempels in justinianischer Zeit, die zwischen den Jahren 535 bis 537 angesetzt werden kann und nicht „about 537" (S. 235; richtig dagegen auf S. 10, wo auch kurz auf die christliche Epoche der Insel verwiesen wird). Zur Dokumentation der Umwandlung sollte jedenfalls auf S. 235 Anm. 22 P. Grossmann, "Die Kirche des Bischofs Theodoros im Isistempel von Philae, Versuch einer Rekonstruktion", *RSO* 58 (1984) 107–117, hinzugezogen werden. Graffiti und Inschriften, die für die Frage nach dem Pilgertum relevant sind, werden zeitlich gegliedert, angefangen von der ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur post-meroitischen Phase. Dabei ergibt sich, daß es sich sowohl um offizielle als auch nicht-offizielle Besuche handelte, die nicht nur aus dem lokalen Bereich kamen. Nicht-inschriftliche Zeugnisse (Prokopius, Priscus) belegen die Nutzung der Tempel von Philae durch die Nobaden und Blemmyer. Insgesamt kann so für mehrere Epochen von Philae als Pilgerstätte gesprochen werden.[1] Der Beitrag enthält leider, überwiegend bei der Zitierung deutscher Titel,

viele Druckfehler (S. 232–234 Anm. 10: „ptolemäischer" statt „ptolemäische"; Anm. 11: „seine" statt „sei"; Anm. 12: „CdE 38 (1963)" statt „CE 43 (1968)"; Anm. 15: „einer" statt „eine"; Anm. 16: „Diocletianus" statt „Diocletian"; S. 236 f. Anm. 25–30 sind elf Fehler, zumeist Umlaute zu zählen; etc.).

D. Montserrat behandelt in "Pilgrimage to the Shrine of SS Cyrus and John at Menouthis in Late Antiquity" das neben der Menasstadt zweite große Pilgerzentrum im Norden Ägyptens. Die aufschlussreiche Erörterung der Datierungsmöglichkeiten zeigt, daß der Kult der Märtyrer Kyros und Johannes wahrscheinlich bereits in den 20-er Jahren des 5. Jh. als Alternative zum bestehenden heilkräftigen Isiskult eingerichtet wurde und bis zum 9. Jahrhundert bestehen blieb. Bei der Auswertung der Informationen von Sophronius können sowohl das Heiligtum näher beschrieben als auch interessante Beobachtungen zu Heilungen zusammengetragen werden.

In "The Pilgrimage Center of Abû Mînâ" wird von P. Grossmann die sakrale und profane Baugeschichte des berühmten Pilgerheiligtums sowie der außerhalb der Stadt liegenden Gebäude komprimiert beschrieben (mit vier Plänen und fünf Tafeln). Ausgehend von einem paganen Hypogaeum, das die sterblichen Überreste des Heiligen bewahrt haben sollte, wurde nach dem Bau eines einfachen Kenotaphs und eines Mausoleums ein Komplex aus mehreren Bauten (Gruftkirche, Querschiffbasilika etc.) errichtet. Es entfaltete sich eine Gesamtanlage mit Stadtmauer, Herbergen, Bädern, Läden usw. Die Interpretation des archäologischen Befundes ermöglicht viele Rückschlüsse auf die Märtyrerverehrung. So kann nicht nur eine Vorstellung von der Ölweihung (S. 285), dem Pilgeransturm (S. 286) oder dem Repräsentationscharakter der kollonierten Prachtstraße (S. 287) gewonnen, sondern auch auf eine Anlage für die Inkubation (S. 288) geschlossen werden. Während die Ostkirche mit den anliegenden Eremitagen das Zentrum eines monastischen Verbundes gebildet haben könnte, schließt der Autor aus der architektonischen Gestaltung der Nordbasilika (u.a. westlicher Umgang und drei Altarnischen in einer Kapelle), daß sie der monophysitischen Kirche angehörte, während die Stadt selbst unter chalkedonensischer Verwaltung gestanden haben soll. Nach einer persischen Zerstörung (bei der Datierung in das Jahr 619 wird angenommen, daß sie im gleichen Jahr wie die Eroberung Alexandriens stattfand) und der arabischen Eroberung Ägyptens gelangte der Ort noch einmal unter monophysitischer Regentschaft zu einer Nachblüte, in der die Gruftkirche als fünfschiffige Basilika wiedererrichtet wurde.

S.J. Davis beschäftigt sich in "Pilgrimage and the Cult of Saint Thecla in Late Antique Egypt" mit der Darstellung der heiligen Thekla auf eini-

gen Menasampullen (nach seiner Liste sind bislang 16 publiziert; im Anhang zwei Tafeln). Unter den vermuteten Gründen für die Zusammenstellung mit Menas nennt er Gemeinsamkeiten in den Legenden und die Möglichkeit, daß ein weibliches Pendant als Vorbild für weibliche Pilger dienen sollte. Überdies verweist er auf die Erwähnung eines Martyrion der Thekla in einem Menaswunder (J. Drescher, *Apa Mena*, Kairo 1946, S. 116 f. Nr. 4). Eine solche Stätte ist nur in den Überlieferungen dieses Wunders erwähnt, archäologisch noch nicht nachgewiesen, aber durch den Befund auf den Menasampullen in Betracht zu ziehen. In einer arabischen Version, die vom Autor nicht beachtet wurde, wird ein Ort namens at-Tûm genannt, in dem sich ein der Thekla geweihtes Gotteshaus befunden haben soll, s. F. Jaritz, *Die arabischen Quellen zum Heiligen Menas*, Heidelberg 1993, S. 168 f., 218 f. Nr. 9. Die Behandlung des Menaswunders erscheint sehr spekulativ. So wird aus der Erzählung, daß in der Nähe des Thekla-Schreins eine bedrohte Frau namens Sophia vom heiligen Menas gerettet und zu seiner eigenen Stätte gebracht wird, auf eine Art Konkurrenzkampf zwischen den beiden Heiligtümern geschlossen (S. 322). Dabei wird außer acht gelassen, daß im Wunder ausdrücklich steht, daß sich die Frau auf den Weg zum Menasheiligtum befindet und wie in anderen Wundern (Drescher, *op. cit.*, S. 118 f. Nr. 15) folgerichtig durch das Eingreifen des Heiligen vor einer Vergewaltigung bewahrt wird. Das Menaswunder kann zwar als Hinweis auf die Existenz einer Thekla-Stätte genannt werden, aber auch wegen gattungskritischer Bedenken darüber hinaus kaum als Indiz für eine besondere Anziehung derselben auf pilgernde Frauen in Ägypten dienen.

In dem Aufsatz von H. Behlmer, "Visitors to Shenoute's Monastery" werden verschiedene Nachrichten über Besuche im Weißen Kloster strukturiert zusammengestellt und wird hinterfragt, ob von einem Pilgertum die Rede sein kann. Für Besuche von Philosophen und anderen Nichtchristen, leitenden Beamten, Mönchen etc. können unterschiedliche Gründe angeführt werden, die von einer Wunder- und Heilssuche in der Nähe eines heiligen Mannes über die Suche nach einem Gespräch bis hin zu diplomatischen Absichten reichen. Das Kloster und die Persönlichkeit Schenutes bildeten offensichtlich einen Anziehungspunkt aus weltlicher und spiritueller Macht. Je nach Definition kann die Bezeichnung als Pilger für verschiedene Kategorien von Besuchern verwendet werden.

Mit dem Beitrag von I. Shahîd, "Arab Christian Pilgrimages in the Proto-Byzantine Period (V–VII Centuries)" wird die ägyptische Landschaft verlassen und über Pilgerstätten von christlichen Arabern berichtet, die im Heiligen Land, auf dem Sinai, Kleinasien, Mesopotamien und in Südarabien

lagen. Der Aufstieg des Islam, verknüpft mit den weltlichen Eroberungen, bedeutete den Anfang vom Ende vieler christlich-arabischer Pilgerheiligtümer.

Der vierte Teil des Buches handelt über die Riten koptischer Pilger. L. Papini, "Fragments of the *Sortes Sanctorum* from the Shrine of St. Colluthus" veröffentlicht zwei Fragmente eines koptischen Pergament-Codex mit Orakelsprüchen, die bereits 1937 in Antinoupolis gefunden wurden (bei der Literaturangabe in Anm. 6 handelt es sich um den Sonderband von *Enchoria* 8). Mit dem Beitrag wird eindrücklich die Fortsetzung der traditionellen ägyptischen Orakelbräuche in der koptischen Märtyrerverehrung demonstriert. L.S.B. MacCoull trägt in ihrem Artikel "Chant in Coptic Pilgrimage" eine Vielzahl von narrativen Quellen für Musik und Gesang zusammen. Da älteres Material nicht erhalten ist, werden einige Hymnen aus dem Difnar angeführt, die als Pilgergesang in Frage kommen. J. Timbie, "A Liturgical Procession in the Desert of Apa Shenoute" versucht die Stationen einer Prozession, bekannt durch einen liturgischen Text mit dem Titel „Das ist der Ritus des Festes der Wüste des Apa Schenute (am) Montag der zweiten Woche der heiligen vierzig Tage" zu rekonstruieren (überliefert in der wahrscheinlich aus dem 15./16. Jh. stammenden trilingualen Handschrift Bibl. Nat. Paris Nr. 68). Dabei werden u.a. die Thesen vertreten, daß es sich bei der ⲧⲕⲉⲗⲍⲉ ⲙⲡⲥⲁϩ (allgemein „Ecke" des Schreibers, Lehrers oder Meisters) um die Ecke des Vorsängers oder Chorleiters handelt und mit dem Begriff θάλασσα ein Schrein mit den sterblichen Überresten Schenutes benannt wird, der sich in der „Kirche ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲥⲁⲙⲟⲩ" befindet. Bei dieser Auffassung fragt es sich, warum die Reihe von Schlüsselwörtern des Textes, die sich tatsächlich auf den Themenkreis „Wasser" beziehen (S. 432), hier für die Interpretation außer acht gelassen werden, während sie an anderer Stelle den Themenkreis „Abend/Nacht" berühren und gleich auf die Tageszeit der Prozession deuten sollen (S. 436). Die Rekonstruktion ist insgesamt ein ernstzunehmender Vorschlag, der in einigen Teilen nicht sicher beweisbar ist, so daß er mit den noch etwas vorsichtigeren Aussagen von H. Quecke, *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Stundengebet*, Louvain 1970, S. 488 ff. in eine Reihe gestellt werden kann.

Im 5. Teil des Bandes beschäftigt sich der Beitrag von D. Brakke, "'Outside the Places, within the Truth': Athanasius of Alexandria and the Localization of the Holy" mit den Gründen für die ablehnende Haltung des Bischofs gegenüber der Heiligenverehrung, wofür er u. a. Stellen aus der *Vita* des Antonius, einen fragmentarischen Brief (PG 26.1189–90) und die Festbriefe Nr. 41 und 42 zu Rate zieht. Mit Pilgerreisen zum Mönchtum

in Ägypten und ihrer schriftlichen Niederlegung befaßt sich G. Frank, "Miracles, Monks, and Monuments: The *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* as Pilgrims' Tales". Mit literaturwissenschaftlichen Fragestellungen wird versucht, die *Historia Monachorum* als Reiseliteratur zu verstehen. In diesem Rahmen werden nicht nur Fragen zur Perspektive eines reisenden Autors, sondern auch zur Aufnahme des Berichtes durch das Publikum erörtert, das mittels solcher Literatur nicht nur in eine exotische Ferne schweifen, sondern das Ideal eines heiligen Lebens in Raum und Zeit imaginativ erleben konnte.

Den Abschluß bilden ein Index sowie der Karten- und Tafelteil. In seiner Gesamtheit vermag der Band mit seinen qualitätvollen Beiträgen dem Leser ein Spiegelbild der Vielfältigkeit und traditionellen Einbindung spätantiken Pilgertums und christlicher Bräuche in Ägypten zu geben.

D-48143 *Münster*, SIEGFRIED RICHTER
Institut für Ägyptologie & Koptologie
Schlaunstraße 2

[1] Über die Fortsetzung der religiösen Bedeutung im Christentum (belegt durch mindestens drei Tempelumwandlungen, drei Kirchenneubauten und einer Übernahme der Titulatur der Isis als Herrin von Philae) s. S.G. Richter, *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, Reichert-Verlag, Wiesbaden (im Druck).

J. N. Bremmer (Ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter. Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 3). Leuven, Peeters, 1998. 213 S., BEF 1370.-, ISBN 90-429-0019-9.

Mit dem vorliegenden Band wird eine Reihe fortgesetzt, die sich einer engen Kooperation zwischen der Reichsuniversität Groningen, der Károli Gáspár Universität und der Loránd-Eötvös-Universität Budapest verdankt: Im Rahmen dieser niederländisch-ungarischen Zusammenarbeit finden seit 1991 jährliche Konferenzen zu einzelnen apokryphen Apostelakten statt; Veröffentlichungen zu den Johannes-Akten (1995) und den Paulus-Akten (1996) sind bereits erschienen, und dem hier anzuzeigenden Band folgte jüngst einer zu den Andreas-Akten (2000). Die drei Stichworte des Untertitels zeigen die Schwerpunkte an, denen sich die fünfzehn Beiträge des Bandes widmen. Abgeschlossen wird er mit einer nützlichen Bibliographie zu den Petrus-Akten von P. J. Lalleman und J. N. Bremmer (S. 200-202) und einem Stichwortindex.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Der einleitende Aufsatz des Herausgebers („Aspects of the *Acts of Peter*: Women, Magic, Place and Date", S. 1-20) kann als eine Art von Einleitung in die Thematik des ganzen Bandes gelesen werden: Bremmer stellt zunächst unter der Überschrift „Women" die schroff enkratischen Tendenzen der Passagen aus dem Berliner koptischen Papyrus heraus – wobei man sich die schöne Szene, in der die Frau des Petrus und ihre wunderschöne Tochter beim Baden beobachtet werden, durchaus nicht nur in Kleinasien (so Bremmer, S. 2) vorstellen kann, sondern auch in Palästina, wie einschlägige rabbinische Quellen und der archäologische Befund deutlich machen. Bremmer verbindet eine kleinteilige Analyse und Kommentierung von Passagen mit einer grundlegenden Einführung in Tendenzen der Texte (so beispielsweise zu mart. Petr. 5 = act. Petr. 34 τοῦ Καίσαρος φίλου = *amici Caesaris*; die Kritik an der Übersetzung trifft nur die englische Übersetzung von Schneemelcher, vgl. NTApo II, 285). Bei dieser Kommentierung der Passagen sammelt er zudem bereits Indizien dafür, daß die Akten in Kleinasien und nicht in Rom entstanden sind; eines seiner Argumente stellt eben die Ehrenbezeugung *amicus Caesaris* dar (S. 6), ein weiteres der intendierte historische Rückbezug, der durch die Personennamen gesetzt wird (S. 15-19). Mehr als – freilich recht starke – Indizien sind es auch nicht; so steht eben im Hintergrund von act. Petr. 28 ein typisch *römisches* Begräbnis (so auch Bremmer, S. 14f.).

Durch seine überaus gründliche Kommentierung einzelner Passagen gelingt es Bremmer auch, die Texte im Rahmen einer allgemeinen antiken Religions- und Kulturgeschichte zum Sprechen zu bringen. Eine solche Form der Kommentierung verlockt aber natürlich, weitere Texte und Literatur nachzutragen:

> Zu der „schwarzen, in schmutzige Lumpen gehüllten (Person)", von der der Senator Marcellus träumt (act. Petr. 22), hätte Bremmer neben dem, was S. 8f. schon genannt ist, auf den schönen Exkurs „Der Schwarze" bei P. Habermehl, Perpetua und der Ägypter oder Bilder des Bösen im frühen afrikanischen Christentum. Ein Versuch zur *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (TU 140), Berlin 1992, 145-160 verweisen können, in der die Stelle aus den Akten ausführlich besprochen wird (S. 154-157); für die Akklamation *tu Romanorum salvator* (act. Petr. 4) auf die Debatte über die Herkunft dieses Wortes, wie sie jetzt M. Wellstein, Nova Verba in Tertullians Schriften gegen die Häretiker aus montanistischer Zeit (BzA 127), Stuttgart und Leipzig 1999, 177-180 zusammengefaßt hat – schließlich ist die Datierung der lateinischen Übersetzung des ursprünglich griechischen Textes kontrovers (S. 18f.). Für die Verbindung dieser Übersetzung mit den Manichäern, die Bremmer zunächst nur aus chronologischen Gründen ausschließt (S. 18f.), könnte man mit Carl Schmidt, Studien zu den alten Petrusakten, ZKG 43 (1924), (320-348) 332-342 auf Augustinus-Texte hinweisen (z.B. Aug., Adim. 17,5; vgl. auch im Beitrag von G.H. Poupon, S. 196f.). Natürlich gibt es auch pagane wie christliche

Parallelen für die Erzählung von der Wiederbelebung eines toten Fisches, über die sich Bremmer etwas verwundert (act. Petr. 13, Bremmer S. 12): J. Engemann, Art. Fisch, RAC VII, 1969, (959-1097) 1011. 1041f. In jedem Falle würde man angesichts solcher verheißungsvoller Proben gern einen regelrechten Kommentar aus der Hand von Bremmer lesen!

Eine Reihe von Beiträgen beschäftigen sich mit kleinteiligeren Themata: I. Karasszon, „Agrippa, King and Prefect", S. 21-28; P. Herczeg, „*Theios aner*: Traits in the Apocryphal *Acts of Peter*" (S. 29-38); ein größeres Thema jeder Beschäftigung mit den *Acta* ist natürlich Simon Magus: G. Luttikhuizen behandelt „Simon Magus as a Narrative Figure in the Acts of Peter" (S. 39-51); T. Adamik „The Image of Simon Magus in the Christian Tradition" (S. 52-64). Ob es wirklich sinnvoll ist, die Frage nach „Simon's teaching" (S. 54-62) ohne jeden Hinweis auf die Debatte zwischen Beyschlag und Lüdemann und Rudolphs entschiedene Parteinahme zu verhandeln (K. Rudolph, „Simon – Magus oder Gnosticus? Zum Stand der Debatte", ThR 42 [1977], 279-359)? Es wäre auch schön gewesen, Leser auf die bequemen Möglichkeiten hinzuweisen, sich über den Stand der Samaritanerforschung zu orientieren: A.D. Crown (Ed.), The Samaritans, Tübingen 1989; ders., A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Metuchen, NJ u.a. ^{2}1993. Eine wirkliche Auseinandersetzung mit den Thesen von Josef Frickel zur „Apophasis Megale" findet nicht statt, er ist auch „Fickel" geschrieben. Mit der Kreuzigung Petri beschäftigen sich J. Bolyki, „‚Head Downwards': The Cross of Peter in the Lights of the Apocryphal Acts, of the New Testament and of the Society-transforming Claim of Early Christianity", S. 111-122 und M. Pesthy, „Cross and Death in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles", S. 123-133 (Bolyki deutet die Haltung Petri am Kreuz als Hinweis auf das Selbstverständnis des Autors und das gesellschaftskritische Programm des zeitgenössischen Christentums überhaupt, aber hier hätte ein Hinweis auf die zeitgenössische Strafrechtspraxis gut getan: M. Hengel, „Crucifixion", in: ders., The Cross of the Son of God, London 1986, [91-185] 125-130). Liuwe H. Westra widmet sich „*Regulae fidei* and Other Credal Formulations in the *Acts of Peter*" (S. 134-147) und expliziert an den Texten die bekannte Einsicht, daß diese freien *regula-fidei*- Formulierungen nicht als Zitate aus später fixierten festen Glaubensbekenntnissen interpretiert werden dürfen, sondern als Formulierungen sui generis wahrgenommen werden müssen. Westra ordnet diese Formulierungen nach Typenbezeichnungen, die er von P. Smulders übernommen hat („dyadic", „monarchical" usf.). Eine besondere Pointe seiner Untersuchung ist die m.E. zutreffende Beobachtung, daß die Verwendung von dyadischen Formeln nicht als Hinweis darauf genom-

men werden darf, daß der Autor einer Schrift eine Konzeption vertritt, für die deutsche Forscher den unglücklichen Begriff „Binitarismus" geprägt haben (S. 141f.).

Neben solchen geistes- und kulturgeschichtlichen Beiträgen finden sich auch zwei literaturwissenschaftliche Zugänge zu den Texten, die neuere Paradigmata wie „Intertextualität" und „the challenge-response game" mit Gewinn auf das einschlägige Material anwenden: C. M. Thomas, „Revivifying Resurrection Accounts: techniques of composition and rewriting in the *Acts of Peter* cc. 25-28", S. 65-83; I. Czachesz, „Who is Deviant? Entering the Story-World of the *Acts of Peter*", S. 84-96.

Zwei Aufsätze schließlich gelten eher philologischen Fragen: A. Hilhorst („The Text of the *Actus Vercellenses*", S. 148-160) informiert zunächst in knapper Form über die Vorgeschichte und die ratio der editio princeps dieses Textes durch Lipsius in den AAA, die er als „excellent edition" anspricht (S. 150). Auch die Ausgabe von Léon Vouaux wird besprochen. Ich nutze die Gelegenheit dieser Rezension, darauf hinzuweisen, daß im Zusammenhang der Neukollation des *Vercellensis* für die Berliner Ausgabe der Pseudo-Clementinen auch eine Neuausgabe der act. Petr. intendiert war und entsprechende Materialien in der Arbeitsstelle „Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller" der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie liegen, die gern zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Der Artikel schließt mit wertvollen Bemerkungen zu vierzehn problematischen Passagen (S. 154-160). Ergänzt wird der Beitrag durch Beobachtungen von G. H. Poupon, deren Hauptthese bereits durch den Titel angezeigt wird: „L'Origine africaine des *Actus Vercellenses*" (S. 192-199). Die Argumentation dafür basiert auf der besonderen Art, in der das explicit des Manuskriptes formuliert ist.

Wer sich über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung zu den act. Petr. orientieren will, ist also gut beraten, diesen Band nicht nur zu konsultieren, sondern seine Beiträge gründlich zu studieren.

D-69117 *Heidelberg*, Wissenschaftlich-theologisches Seminar, Kisselgasse 1 CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES

BOOKS RECEIVED

Arnobius the Younger: *Arnobii Iunioris, Praedestinatus qui dicitur*, cvra et stvdio F. Gori (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, XXV B), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, xxii + 135 pp., ISBN 2-503-00256-0, EUR 62 (pb).

Augustine, *De bono coniugali; De sancta virginitate*. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Notes by P.G. Walsh (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford: Clarendon Press 2001, xxxv + 164 pp., ISBN 0-19-826995-1, £ 35.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Bähnk, Wiebke, *Von der Notwendigkeit des Leidens. Die Theologie des Martyriums bei Tertullian* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 78), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 2001, 355 S., ISBN 3-525-55186-X, DM 118,– (Geb.).—A thorough analysis of Tertullian's rigorist theology and interpretation of martyrdom in the context of the conflicts in Carthage. Later, bishop Cyprian, while drawing on Tertullian's theology, comes to view martyrdom as an 'unbloody' and 'daily' part of Christian life.

Basser, Herbert W., *Studies in Exegesis. Christian Critiques of Jewish Law and Rabbinic Responses 70-300 C.E.* (The Brill Reference Library of Ancient Judaism 2), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xiv + 148 pp., ISBN 90-04-11848-9, NLG 158,67 / US $ 89 (bound).

DeConick, April D., *Voices of the Mystics. Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 157, Sheffield Academic Press 2001, 191 pp., ISBN 1-184127-190-X, UK £ 31.50 / US $ 52.50 (cloth with book jacket).

DIADOCH. *Revista de estudios de filosofía platónica y cristiana*. Vol. 2, N° 1-2, 1999. Instituto de Filosofía, Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago / Departamento de Filosofía, Universidad Argentina John F. Kennedy, Buenos Aires. ISSN 0717-4292, Chile $ 3.500 / Argentina $ 8 / Extranjero US $ 18 (incluido fleto aéreo).—Studies on e.g. Athanasius, Plotinus and the Gnostics, Maximus Confessor, Augustine, Origen.

Dill, Ueli & Beat R. Jenny (mit einem Beitrag von Alfred R. Weber), *Aus der Werkstatt der Amerbach-Edition. Christoph Vischer zum 90. Geburtstag* (Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel, Band 2), Basel: Schwabe & Co. AG 2000, 483 S. (inkl. 11 Abb.), ISBN 3-7965-1087-6, SFr 58 / DM 68 / ÖS 490 (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).—Important source material about the famous printer's and editor's family of Amerbach, well known for its many patristic editions. With significant information on e.g. Erasmus.

Duval, Yvette, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 164), Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes 2000 [Diffuseur exclusif: Brepols, Turnhout, Belgium], 524 p. + 11 figures, ISBN 2-85121-181-1, FF 300 / EUR 45,73 (pb).

Ferdi, Sabah, *Augustin de retour en Afrique 388-430. Repères archéologiques dans le patrimoine algérien*, Tipasa, Algérie: Musée de Tipasa / Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires 2001, 176 pp., ISBN 2-8271-0895-X (cloth bound).

Fontaine, Jacques, *Isidore de Séville. Genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths*, Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 486 pp. + carte + maintes figures, ISBN 2-503-50955, EUR 32 (pb).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Frankfurter, David, *Religion in Roman Egypt. Assimilation and Resistance*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 2001, xvi + 314 pp., ISBN 0-691-07054-7, $ 16.95 / £ 10.50 (pb).—Detailed examination of the impact of Christianity on classical Egyptian society under Roman rule; exploration of the complex acceptance of Christianity by the Egyptian people in the Byzantine period; first paperback edition of an acclaimed book (1st ed. 1998).

Haines-Eitzen, Kim, *Guardians of Letters. Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*, Oxford University Press USA: Oxford-New York 2000, x + 212 pp., ISBN 0-19-513564-4, £ 34,50 (cloth with jacket).

Hieronymus: *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, Opera III, Opera Polemica 4, *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*, edidit A. Canellis (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, LXXIX B), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, XII + 137* (Introduction) + 104 pp., ISBN 2-503-00796-1, EUR 97 (pb).

Horrell, David G. & Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy and Community. New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 99), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xxi + 404 pp., ISBN 90-04-11679-6, DFL 189,52 / US $ 106 (clothbound with book jacket).—'. . . represent a range of approaches and topics, connected together by a focus on various kinds of christological claim, whether by the historical Jesus, in the Q tradition, John, Paul or the synoptics, and their connection with controversy and the construction of early Christian community'.

Isidore of Sevilla: *Isidori Hispalensis Versus*, cura et studio José María Sánchez Martín (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, CXIII A), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 274 pp., ISBN 2-503-01134-9, EUR 144 (pb).

Jackson-McCabe, Matt A., *Logos and Law in the Letter of James. The Law of Nature, the Law of Moses, and the Law of Freedom* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 100), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xvi + 281 pp., ISBN 90-04-11994-9, DFL 178,50 / US $ 100 (clothbound with book jacket).—'. . . argues that James understands the Torah to be a written expression of the divine law the Stoics correlated with human reason'. With extensive discussion of, e.g., Philo, *4 Maccabees*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and Justin Martyr's *Second Apology*.

Lubac, Henri de, *Medieval Exegesis. The Four Senses of Scripture*. Volume I, translated by Marc Sebanc, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1998, xxiv + 466 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4145-7, US $ 45.00 (pb); Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis. The Four Senses of Scripture*. Volume II, translated by E.M. Macierowski, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2000, xiii + 439 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4146-5, US $ 45.00 (pb).—Originally published in French as *Exegèse médiévale*, Henri de Lubac's study of medieval exegesis has remained one of the most significant works of modern scholarship. It is a kind of encyclopedia of patristic and medieval exegesis of the Scriptures. Foreword by Robert Louis Wilken.

Lüdemann, Gerd (Hrsg.), *Studien zur Gnosis* (Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums, Band 9), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern etc.: Peter Lang 1999, 287 S., ISBN 3-631-34331-0, SFR 64,– (pb).—Drei Aufsätze: (1) Gerd Lüdemann, 'Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge der simonianischen Gnosis' (7-20); Martina Janßen, 'Mystagogus Gnosticus? Zur Gattung der »gnostischen Gespräche des Auferstandenen«' (21-260!); Roald A. Zellweger, 'Das Mandäerproblem im Lichte des frühen syrischen Christentums' (261-287).

Markschies, Christoph, *Alta Trinità Beata. Gesammelte Studien zur altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000, XI + 333 S., ISBN 3-16-147298-5, DM 128,–

(Fadengeheftete Broschur).—Seven studies, partly revised and expanded, by a leading patristic scholar: (1) '«Sessio ad dexteram». Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der Diskussion der altkirchlichen Theologen'; (2) '«Die wunderliche Mähr von zwei Logoi . . .». Clemens Alexandrinus, Fragment 23 - Zeugnis eines *Arius ante Arium* oder des arianischen Streites selbst?'; (3) 'Theologische Diskussionen zur Zeit Konstantins. Arius, der «arianische Streit» und das Konzil von Nicaea, die nachnizänischen Auseinandersetzungen bis 337'; (4) 'Gibt es eine einheitliche «kappadozische Trinitätstheologie»? Vorläufige Erwägungen zu Einheit und Differenzen neunizänischer Theologie'; (5) 'Was ist lateinischer «Neunizänismus»? Ein Vorschlag für eine Antwort'; (6) 'Ambrosius als Trinitätstheologe'; (7) '« . . . et tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus . . .». Zum Stand der Erforschung der altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie'. With 'Einleitung' and excellent indices.

Mosheim, Johann Lorenz von, *Versuch einer unpartheiischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte*, Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner 1995, xlv + 56 + 466 S., ISBN 3-927718-33-5, DM 78 (Halbleinen)—Reprint of the edition of Helmstedt 1746, with 'Einleitung' and 'Kommentierende Anmerkungen' by Dirk Fleischer. For students of patristics, Mosheim's second and main part on the gnostic sect of the Ophites still has its (restricted) value.

Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire / Orthodoxy, Christianity, History, édité par Susanna Elm, Éric Rebillard et Antonella Romano (Collection de l'École française de Rome 270), Rome: École française de Rome 2000 [Diffusion en France: De Boccard, 11 Rue de Médicis, 75006 Paris], xxv + 404 pp., ISBN 2-7283-0591-9 (pb).—Results from the research group «Définir, maintenir et remettre en cause l'orthodoxie dans l'histoire du christianisme» (École française de Rome, University of California at Berkeley, with the support of the Fondation France-Berkeley). Case studies (in French and English) on e.g. Orthodox monasticism (Daniel Caner), Augustine of Hippo (Robert Dodaro), Gregory of Nazianze (Susanna Elm), Epiphanius of Salamis (Rebecca Lyman), the Pelagian controversy (Éric Rebillard), Theodoret of Cyrus (Helen Sillett), the Three Chapters controversy (Claire Sotinel), and an overview of 'Orthodoxie et hérésie aux premiers siècles dans l'historiographie récente' (Alain Le Boulluec).

Paulinus Nolanus: Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani, *Carmina; Indices Voluminum XXIX et XXX*, edidit Guilelmus de Hartel. Editio altera supplementis aucta curante Margit Kamptner (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum XXX), Vindobonae: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1999, XXXXIII + 638 S., ISBN 3-7001-2865-7 (broschiert).

Runia, David T. & Gregory E. Sterling (eds.), *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Vol. XII, 2000 (Brown Judaic Studies 328), Providence: Brown Judaic Studies 2000, viii + 241 pp., ISBN 1-930675-04-6, $ 34.95 (cloth).—J.R. Royse, 'The Text of Philo's *Legum Allegoriae*'; T.H. Tobin, 'The Beginning of Philo's *Legum Allegoriae*'; A. van den Hoek, 'Philo and Origen: a Descriptive Catalogue of their Relationship'; S. Étienne, 'Réflexion sur l'apostasie de Tibérius Julius Alexander'; D.T. Runia, 'Alexandria and Cambridge: James Kugel's *Traditions of the Bible*'; Bibliography; Reviews.

Strauß, David Friedrich, *Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesus der Geschichte. Eine Kritik des Schleiermacher'schen Lebens Jesu*, neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Angelika Dörfler-Dierken und Jörg Dierken, Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner 2000, 45 + XII + 240 S., ISBN 3-933688-42-6, DM 28 (kartoniert).

Tertullien, *Contre Marcion*, Tome IV (Livre IV). Texte critique par Claudio Moreschini. Introduction, traduction et commentaire par René Braun (Sources Chrétiennes 456),

Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, 545 p., ISBN 2-204-06585-4, FF 310 (broché).—'Ce livre constitue une mine précieuse d'informations concernant le marcionisme, sa doctrine et ses Écritures; il apporte en même temps un témoignage capital sur le texte et la traduction latine de l'Évangile, comme sur la réception de celui-ci, entre orthodoxie et hétérodoxie, dans le christianisme du début du IIIe siècle'.

Thiselton, Anthony C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary), Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2000, 1424 pp., ISBN 0-8028-2449-8, US $ 75.00 (hardcover with jacket).—'the most detailed and comprehensive commentary on the Greek text of 1 Cortinthians in English . . . with major issues of interpretation from the Church Fathers . . .'.

Trompf, G.W., *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice*, London & New York: Continuum 2000, XX + 362 pp., ISBN 0-8264-5294-9, £ 55.00 (hardback).

Turner, John D. & Ruth Majercik (eds.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism. Themes, Figures, and Texts*, Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2000, xiii + 338 pp., ISBN 0-88414-035-0, US$ 44.95 (pb).—Ten indepth studies by leading scholars, edited in an exemplary way: Einer Thomassen, 'The Derivation of Matter in Monistic Gnosticism'; Kevin Corrigan, 'Positive and Negative Matter in Later Platonism: The Uncovering of Plotinus's Dialogue with the Gnostics'; Gregory Shaw, 'After Aporia: Theurgy in Later Platonism'; John D. Turner, 'Ritual in Gnosticism'; Kevin Corrigan, 'Platonism and Gnosticism. The Anonymous *Commentary* on the *Parmenides*: Middle or Neoplatonic?'; John D. Turner, 'The Setting of the Platonizing Sethian Treatises in Middle Platonism'; John F. Finamore, 'Iamblichus, the Sethians, and *Marsanes*'; John Peter Kenney, 'Ancient Apophatic Theology'; Michael A. Williams, 'Negative Theologies and Demiurgical Myths in Late Antiquity'; Frederic M. Schroeder, 'Aseity and Connectedness in the Plotinian Philosophy of Providence'. With a Bibliography and a List of Abbreviations.

Williams, J.P., *Denying Divinity. Apophasis in the Patristic Christian and Soto Zen Buddhist Traditions*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, vii + 249 pp., ISBN 0-19-826999-4, £ 40.00 (cloth with book jacket).—'. . . argues for a new understanding of what is meant by apophatic theology, supported by extensive analysis of the texts of Dionysius the Areopagite, St Maximus the Confessor, and Zen Master Dogen'.

Winkelmann, Friedhelm, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit* (Berliner Byzantinistische Studien, Band 6), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern etc.: Peter Lang 2001, xviii + 307 S., ISBN 3-631-37377-5, SFR 79,– (Leinen).

IRENÄUS UND DIE VALENTINIANISCHE SCHULE

ZUR *PRAEFATIO* VON *ADV. HAER.* 1*

VON

JENS HOLZHAUSEN

Das erste Buch seines Werkes "Gegen die Häresien" (adv. haer. 1, um 180 n. Chr. verfaßt) hat Irenäus von Lyon klar aufgebaut und in drei Teile gegliedert:[1]

1. Ein valentinianisches Lehrsystem (Kap. 1-9)
2. Die unterschiedlichen Lehren der Valentinianer (Kap. 11-21)
3. Der Stammbaum der Valentinianer (Kap. 23-31)

In den ersten neun Kapiteln referiert (und kommentiert) er ein valentinianisches System, das keinem bestimmten Autor zugewiesen wird (eingeführt durch das unbestimmte "sie sagen" etc.);[2] in Kap. 10 stellt er einen kurzen Abriß der kirchlichen Lehre dagegen. Die Kirche zeichne sich dadurch aus, daß sie an allen Orten "einen und denselben Glauben" (μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν) besitze (10,1), die Lehre der Valentinianer sei dagegen "unbeständig" (ἄστατος) (11,1). Aus dieser Behauptung ergibt sich der zweite Teil, in dem die Unterschiede der valentinianischen Lehren beschrieben werden, wobei auch hier eine Zusammenfassung der kirchlichen Wahrheit den Abschluß bildet (Kap. 22). Dieser zweite Teil ist einerseits nach Personen und andererseits thematisch angeordnet. Folgende sieben Personen oder Gruppen werden dargestellt: der Gründer Valentin (11,1), Sekundos (11,2), "ein weiterer berühmter Lehrer" (11,3), "eine andere Gruppe" (11,5), die Anhänger des Ptolemaios (οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, 12,1), "eine noch klügere Gruppe" (12,3) und schließlich Markos und seine Schüler (13,1-16,3).[3] In

* Ich danke meiner Frau, Ulrike Wagner-Holzhausen, für Diskussion und Korrektur dieses Aufsatzes.

[1] Ich zitiere nach A. Rousseau/L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre I (Tome I-II)*, Paris 1979 (SC 263-4).

[2] Zur Zuschreibung dieses Systems an Ptolemaios s. unten S. 350.

[3] Zur Abgrenzung des Markos-Referats s. N. Foerster, *Marcus Magus* (WUNT 114), Tübingen 1999, 7ff.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

thematischer Hinsicht werden die Meinungsunterschiede der Valentinianer an ihrem Streit um den Erlöser (12,4) und ihren Lehren von der Erlösung (21,1-5) gezeigt:[4]

> ὅσοι γάρ εἰσι ταύτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοί, τοσαῦται καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεις.
>
> Wie viele Mystagogen dieser Lehre es gibt, so viele Erlösungen gibt es auch.

Die Abschnitte 17,1-2 über die valentinianische Sicht der Schöpfung und 18,1-20,3 über ihren Gebrauch der Schrift, besonders des Alten Testaments, stellen eher Nachträge zum ersten Teil dar; denn in ihnen hat Irenäus das Thema der Unterschiedlichkeit der Lehren aus dem Auge verloren.[5] Hatte er im ersten Teil in den Kapiteln 3,1-6 und 8,1-5 die ntl. Schriftbelege angeführt, so werden jetzt die von den Valentinianern herangezogenen "Prophetenworte" nachgereicht.

Überblickt man den gesamten zweiten Teil, ist festzustellen, daß der Bericht über Markos und seine Schüler genausoviel Raum einnimmt wie alle anderen Berichte zusammen. Neben Valentin, dem Gründer, und Markos, von dem Irenäus neben mündlichen Nachrichten u.a. sicherlich auch eine Originalquelle (14,1-16,2) benutzen konnte, nennt er nur zwei Namen (Sekundos und Ptolemaios' Schule); beide werden sehr knapp abgehandelt. In den thematischen Abschnitten werden nie konkrete Namen genannt, sondern Irenäus beschränkt sich auf die 3. Pers. Plural oder spricht von οἱ μέν—οἱ δέ, ἄλλοι, ἔνιοι und ähnlichem. Dieses Verfahren überrascht: Von einem Autor, der die Zerstrittenheit einer Schule darstellen möchte, erwartet man eher, daß er die unterschiedlichen Lehren zum Beweis seiner Behauptung bestimmten Lehrern zuweist. Noch auffälliger ist, daß er den in Kap. 11,3 ohne Namen genannten "berühmten Lehrer" in Kap. 15,1 als Markos identifiziert.[6] Irenäus gelingt es offensichtlich nicht (oder ist nicht daran interessiert), seinem Leser ein klares Bild von den unterschiedlichen Richtungen zu geben. Der Grund für diese Unklarheit dürfte auch in dem von Irenäus benutzten Quellenmaterial liegen. Erst dem aufmerksamen Leser wird deutlich, daß sich die Unterschiede im wesentlichen auf den Aufbau der göttlichen transzendenten Welt (Pleroma) und die Herkunft des Erlösers beziehen; anderes wird Irenäus' Quelle nicht geboten haben.

---

[4] In 21,1 fällt gleichsam rahmend noch einmal das Stichwort ἄστατος: Die Überlieferung der valentinianischen Erlösung sei "unbeständig".

[5] Einzig in 18,2 werden unterschiedliche Lehren die Anthropogonie betreffend erwähnt.

[6] Vgl. dazu Förster (A. 3), 14f. und 293ff.

Der dritte Teil des ersten Buches (Kap. 23-31) enthält den berühmten Stammbaum der Valentinianer, der mit Simon Magus anhebt: "Es war nötig, für alle sichtbar zu beweisen, daß die Valentinianer von solchen Müttern, Vätern und Vorvätern abstammen . . .".[7] Die Quelle dieses Teiles ist wahrscheinlich Justins verlorenes "Syntagma"; das Problem, in welcher Weise Irenäus diese Quelle bearbeitet hat, kann hier beiseite blieben.[8]

Blickt man nun auf die "praefatio" zu Beginn des Werkes, in der Irenäus den Inhalt und die Zielsetzung des ersten Buches beschreibt, so fällt zuerst auf, daß er den dritten Teil dieses Buches nicht ankündigt.[9] Dies mag seinen Grund darin finden, daß er sich bewußt ist, diesen Abschnitt von einem anderen Autor übernommen zu haben, und deshalb darin keine im Vorwort herauszustellende Leistung gesehen hat. Möglicherweise entstand der Plan, einen Stammbaum der Valentinianer anzufügen, auch erst, nachdem Irenäus das Prooimion verfaßt hatte.

Wichtiger ist die Beobachtung, daß Irenäus die ersten beiden Teile seines ersten Buches exakt ankündigt. Ich referiere die beiden entscheidenden Sätze in ihrer Hauptaussage (praef. 2):

1) ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην . . . μηνύσαι σοι, ἀγαπητέ, τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια . . .
2) καὶ, καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, . . ., ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν . . .

1) Ich hielt es für notwendig . . ., dir, mein Lieber, die wundersamen und tiefgründigen Mysterien kundzutun . . .
2) Und, soweit es in meiner Möglichkeit steht, werde ich die Lehrmeinung von denen, die jetzt Falsches lehren, . . ., die eine Blütenlese der Lehre Valentins darstellt, kurz und klar mitteilen . . .

---

[7] Iren. haer. 1,31,3: "a talibus matribus et patribus et proavis (sc. esse) eos, qui a Valentino sint, . . . necessarium fuit manifeste arguere . . ."; in der griechischen Vorlage vermutlich: ἐκ τοιούτων μητέρων τε καὶ πατέρων καὶ προγόνων ὄντας (oder γεγονότας) τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου . . . ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἐξελέγξαι; der lat. Übersetzer hat das wohl im gr. Original stehende Partizip ὄντας (oder γεγονότας) nicht eigens wiedergegeben. Rousseau/Doutreleau (A. 1), I 313-5 wollen "matribus" streichen; mit "matres und patres" sind aber m.E. die "Gnostiker" von Kap. 29-30 gemeint, wobei "Mütter" sich auf die weibliche Barbelo in Kap. 29 bezieht und "Väter" auf die Lehrer von Kap. 30 ("alii"); mit "Vorväter" sind Simon und die Simonianer gemeint; s. dazu meinen Aufsatz "Gnostizismus, Gnosis, Gnostiker" im JbAC 44, 2001.

[8] Dazu siehe z.B. den Forschungsüberblick bei W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1996, 257ff.

[9] Anders im Rückblick auf das erste Buch im Prooimion des zweiten, wo er seinen Überblick über Simon und dessen Nachfolger herausstellt.

Irenäus kündigt zwei Arbeitsschritte an (durch καί verbunden), die durch die inhaltlich synonymen Verben μηνύειν und ἀπαγγέλλειν umschrieben werden:[10] In einem ersten Schritt will er die "Geheimnisse" seiner Gegner aufdecken. Diese Ankündigung bezieht sich offensichtlich auf den ersten Teil des ersten Buches, in dem Irenäus einen valentinianischen Systementwurf nachzeichnet. Die Richtigkeit dieser Zuordnung wird durch die Wiederholung des Ausdrucks τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια in Kap. 4,3 gesichert: an dieser Stelle nennt Irenäus die in Kap. 1-9 referierten kosmogonischen Lehren noch einmal "wundersame und tiefgründige Geheimnisse".[11]

Als zweiten Arbeitsschritt kündigt er im Vorwort an, sich "den jetzt Lehrenden" zu widmen. Mit diesem zweiten Schritt sind die Kapitel 11-21 gemeint, die nach den einführenden Bemerkungen über Valentin selbst seinen verschiedenen Nachfolgern gewidmet sind. Der Ausdruck "die jetzt Lehrenden" kann dabei nur im Kontrast zu dem "früher" lehrenden Valentin gemeint sein. Der Grund für die Tatsache, daß der Abschnitt über die "jetzt Lehrenden" dessen ungeachtet mit Valentin selbst beginnt, liegt darin, daß Irenäus das Kapitel, wie oben gezeigt, unter das Thema: "Uneinheitlichkeit der valentinianischen Lehren" stellt. Folgerichtig mußte auch Valentin selbst behandelt werden, da seine Lehre angesichts der Vielfalt der valentinianischen Systeme nur noch eine unter vielen ist.

Es fällt auf, daß Irenäus die verschiedenen Richtungen der Valentinianer mit dem singularischen Wort "Lehrmeinung" oder "Lehrgebäude" (γνώμη) bezeichnet.[12] Bei aller Unterschiedlichkeit der einzelnen Richtungen, die er breit herausstellt und kritisiert, sieht Irenäus dennoch die valentinianische Schule als Einheit. So vergleicht er in ironischem Ton die Lehren der Nachfolger mit einer Blütenlese (ἀπάνθισμα) aus Valentins mündlicher (und schriftlicher) Lehre,[13] d.h. die Schüler haben nach Irenäus im Garten ihres Schulhauptes die schönsten "Blüten" gepflückt und dann als die eigenen

---

[10] Er fügt an: καὶ ἀφορμὰς δώσομεν κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν μετριότητα πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέπειν αὐτήν "und ich will in meiner Mittelmäßigkeit Anhaltspunkte geben für die Widerlegung ihrer Lehre". Dies ist kein eigener Teil, sondern geschieht fortlaufend als Kommentar nach dem Referat bestimmter Lehren. Die eigentliche Widerlegung beginnt mit Buch 2.

[11] Iren. haer. 1,4,3 ἀλλὰ ἀνακεχωρηκότα καὶ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια μετὰ πολλοῦ καμάτου περιγινόμενα τοῖς φιλοψευδέσι, vgl. auch 1,1,3 τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ καὶ ἀπόρρητα μυστήρια.

[12] Vgl. auch oben 21,1: ὅσοι γάρ εἰσι ταύτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοί κτλ.

[13] ἡ Οὐαλεντίνου σχολή meint hier nicht Valentins Schule als die Gruppe von Personen, die Valentin unterrichtet, sondern konkret das gesamte Produkt seiner wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung, s. LSJ s.v. II 1: "learned discussion, disputation, lecture".

ausgegeben. Abgepflückte Blüten allerdings erfreuen sich nicht lange ihrer Schönheit, sondern verwelken (s. ἀπανθεῖν "verblühen"). Eine weitere florale Metapher kehrt am Ende des zweiten Teils wieder. Irenäus vergleicht dort die valentinianische Schule mit einem Baum und seinen vielen Verzweigungen (22,2):[14]

> . . . necessarium arbitrati sumus prius referre fontem et radicem eorum, ut . . . intellegas arborem, de qua defluxerunt tales fructus.
> . . . ich (Irenäus) hielt es für notwendig, zuerst über ihre Quelle und Wurzel zu informieren, damit man den Baum erkennt, von dem solche Früchte kommen.

Der Ausdruck "solche Früchte" bezieht sich auf den Inhalt der vorhergehenden Kap. 11-21 und meint die Lehren der verschiedenen Nachfolger Valentins ("Quelle und Wurzel" sind die angeblichen gnostischen Vorläufer Valentins, die von Simon Magus ausgehen).[15] Wie diese Lehren hier als "Früchte" bezeichnet werden, so nennt er sie im Vorwort "Blütenlese".[16] Von entscheidenden Differenzen zwischen Lehrer und Schülern verraten diese Bilder jedenfalls nichts. Irenäus betont im Vorwort die Schwierigkeit, diese unterschiedlichen Lehren darzustellen ("soweit es in meiner Möglichkeit steht"); auch dies dürfte ein Hinweis auf die Dürftigkeit oder Unklarheit des vorhandenen Quellenmaterials sein.

Soweit ist der Text des Vorworts gut verständlich und entspricht dem späteren Inhalt des ersten Buches. Dies trifft dagegen nicht auf den bisher ausgelassenen Halbsatz zu: . . . τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, **λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον**, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς κτλ. Die Gleichsetzung der "jetzt Lehrenden" mit "Ptolemaios' Anhängern" erstaunt.[17] Sollte Irenäus gemeint haben, daß alle im zweiten Teil genannten Lehrer (mit Ausnahme natürlich von Valentin) Ptolemaios' Schüler

---

[14] Vgl. Iren. adv. haer. 1,4,4: Irenäus imitiert valentinianische Lehren und resümiert: ἁρμόζουσι γὰρ τοιοῦτοι καρποὶ τῇ ὑποθέσει αὐτῶν.

[15] Denkt man den Vergleich zu Ende, ergibt sich, daß Valentin selbst den Stamm des Baumes darstellt.

[16] Vgl. Scholia in Pind. Ol. 3, 6g: ἀπάνθισμα, καρπόν· τῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν νίκης ὁ ὕμνος καρπός.

[17] Vgl. D. Wanke, Irenäus und die Häretiker in Rom, ZAC 3, 1999, 203f.: "Diese Angabe überrascht deshalb, weil die 'gegenwärtigen Falschlehrer', mit denen sich Irenäus in erster Linie auseinandersetzen müßte, gar nicht 'die um Ptolemäus' sind, sondern (ebenfalls) Valentinianer, die in der Nähe von Lyon aufgetaucht waren, sich auf den Magier Markos berufen und in den Gemeinden für derartige Unruhe gesorgt hatten, daß die Verunsicherung immer noch mit Händen zu greifen ist." Er zieht aus der Beobachtung allerdings andere Folgerungen, s. A. 24.

sind? Wohl nicht, denn weder Sekundos noch Markos noch irgend ein anderer werden im zweiten Teil (oder anderswo) so genannt.[18] Und wenn alle "jetzt Lehrenden" "Schüler des Ptolemaios" wären, ist es nicht einzusehen, warum dann Ptolemaios' Anhänger in Kap. 12,1 einzeln für sich besprochen werden;[19] diese Gruppe stellt nur eine unter den sieben in Kap. 11-21 genannten valentinianischen Richtungen dar, die weder zuerst behandelt wird, so daß alle anderen aus ihr abgeleitet würden, noch einen besonderen Stellenwert erhält (ihr ist kaum eine halbe Seite gewidmet); sie umfaßt nicht die Gesamtheit der "jetzt Lehrenden". Die Bemerkung ist also irreführend und sachlich unzutreffend. Es gibt keinen ersichtlichen Grund, warum Irenäus seine Leser im Vorwort fehlleiten sollte, indem er die "jetzt Lehrenden" auf Ptolemaios' Schule beschränkt, um dann neben dieser weitere (wenn auch z.T. unbenannte) Valentinianer zu besprechen, die er im Vorwort verschweigt (zumindest die Nennung des Markos, der die Hälfte des Raums einnimmt, würde man erwarten).[20] Der Halbsatz widerspricht zudem der oben herausgestellten Tendenz des Irenäus, Namen zu vermeiden (in der Praefatio wird sonst alleine der Name "Valentin" genannt). Weiterhin wird im Text nicht Ptolemaios' Schule als "Blütenlese"

---

[18] Iren. haer. 1,13,1: Markos rühmt sich, τοῦ διδασκάλου διορθωτής zu sein, kann sich m.E. nur auf Valentin beziehen, vgl. 1,11,1: ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας Οὐαλεντῖνος κτλ.; hier wird Valentin explizit ein διδασκαλεῖον zugeschrieben; vgl. 1,12,1 (nach Epiphan. haer. 33,1): οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος . . . ἔτι ἐμπειρότερος ἡμῖν τοῦ ἑαυτῶν διδασκάλου, auch hier ist "ihr Lehrer" Valentin.

[19] Iren. haer. 12,1 οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον ἐμπειρότεροι . . . λέγουσιν "die Anhänger des Ptolemaios, die mehr Erfahrung haben (als die in Kap. 11,5 genannte Gruppe), sagen . . ."; der Ausdruck οἱ περί τινα kann sowohl inklusiv (der übliche Gebrauch, s. LSJ s.v. περί C I 2): "Ptolemaios und seine Anhänger" als auch exklusiv: "Ptolemaios' Anhänger" (aber nicht Ptolemaios) gemeint sein, letzteres in adv. haer. 1,27,1 οἱ περὶ τὸν Σίμωνα (wo Simon selbst nicht gemeint ist). Diese Formulierung, die neben der genannten Simon-Stelle nur für Ptolemaios benutzt wird (Valentin, Sekundos und Markos werden mit einfachem Namen bezeichnet) scheint darauf zu deuten, daß Ptolemaios um 180 n. Chr. nicht mehr lebt (wahrscheinlich ist er der in Just. 2. Apol. 2,9 gemeinte Märtyrer, der um 152 n. Chr. starb, s. Wanke [A. 17], 207-11 mit Hinweis auf haer. 4,33,9, wo Irenäus zugeben muß, daß auch "ein oder zwei" Häretiker das Martyrium erlitten); nur Ptolemaios' Anhänger gehören also zu den "jetzt Lehrenden"; das bedeutet nicht, daß Irenäus auf inhaltlicher Ebene zwischen Ptolemaios und seinen Schülern unterscheiden wollte und konnte; er macht keine einzige Bemerkung in dieser Hinsicht, was er sicherlich getan hätte, wenn ihm Entsprechendes in seinen Quellen oder aus mdl. Informationen zu Gebote gestanden hätte; anders z.B. bei Markos und seinen Schülern, wo differenziert wird (s. Kap. 13,6). Insofern hat der Ausdruck οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον seinen einzigen Grund in der Tatsache, daß Ptolemaios nicht zu den "jetzt Lehrenden" gerechnet werden kann; insofern weicht Irenäus auf "Ptolemaios' Anhänger" aus.

[20] In Iren. haer. 2 prooem. 1 wird Markos jedenfalls explizit genannt.

der Lehre Valentins bezeichnet, sondern die Gesamtheit der jetzt Lehrenden (ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν bezieht sich auf τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων). Durch den Einschub des Ptolemaios entsteht der von manchen Interpreten[21] geteilte mißverständliche Eindruck, allein Ptolemaios' Schule stelle die "Blüte" dar, was schon aus grammatischen Gründen nicht zutrifft. Die Bemerkung über Ptolemäus' Schule muß als Erklärung für den unbestimmten Ausdruck: "die jetzt Falsches Lehrenden" in den Text geraten sein;[22] dafür bot sich der Name des berühmten Schülers an. Der Satz "ich meine die Schule des Ptolemaios" muß demgemäß als spätere Glosse aus dem Text des Irenäus gestrichen werden.[23] Irenäus' erstes Buch richtet sich gegen die valentinianische Schule als solche, nicht gegen eine bestimmte Richtung in ihr.[24]

Nach der Ankündigung des zweiten Teils im Vorwort soll nun die des ersten genauer betrachtet werden. Dieser Abschnitt ist besonders wichtig, weil Irenäus hier eine Angabe über die Quelle seiner Darlegungen macht:

> ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δ' αὐτῶν καὶ συμβαλὼν καὶ καταλαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν μηνύσαι σοι, ἀγαπητὲ, τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια . . .
>
> Nachdem ich auf Schriften von Leuten gestoßen bin, die, wie sie selbst sagen, Schüler Valentins seien, und auch mit einigen von ihnen zusammentraf und Kenntnis von ihrer Lehre erhielt, hielt ich es für notwendig, dir, mein Lieber, die wundersamen und tiefen Mysterien kundzutun . . .

---

[21] Vgl. z.B. D.J. Unger, *Irenaeus* (Ancient Christ. Writers 55), New York 1992, 22 übersetzt: "We are speaking of the disciples of Ptolemaeus, an offshoot of the Valentinian school"; M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism"*, Princeton 1996, 14: ". . . Ptolemy, whose doctrine Irenaeus refers to as the 'choice flower' of the Valentinian school"; Wanke (A. 17), 203: ". . . ich rede von denen um Ptolemäus, einem Ableger der Schule Valentins . . ."

[22] Die einzige Möglichkeit, die ich sehe, den Ausdruck im Text zu behalten, liegt darin, λέγω δή im Sinne von "ich meine z.B. die Schule des Ptolemaios" zu verstehen; einen Beleg dafür vermag ich nicht zu finden; folgende Stellen sprechen eher gegen eine solche Bedeutung: Aristeas ep. 233,2 λέγω δὴ οἷον θάνατοί τε καὶ νόσοι καὶ λῦπαι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, Hermias in Plat. Phaedr. 114,19 λέγω δὴ βουλήσεις καὶ δόξαι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, Philop. in Arist. Anal. post. CAG 13,3, 183,2: λέγω δὴ τὰ τετράγωνα τῆς σελήνης σχήματα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄττα (hier liegt das "z.B." im τοιαῦτα).

[23] Sprachlich kann man als wichtiges Indiz werten, daß die Phrase λέγω δή nach TLG nur an dieser Stelle im Werk des Irenäus vorkommt.

[24] So Wanke (A. 17), der aus dem Vorwort folgert, Irenäus habe vor allem die römischen Anhänger des Ptolemaios im Auge. Überzeugend scheint mir die Ausrichtung des Werkes auf Rom als einem Zentrum der valentinianischen Schule, nicht aber die Verengung auf Ptolemaios' Schule; vgl. haer 2 prooem. 1: "in eo quidem libro, qui ante hunc est, . . . ostendimus tibi, dilectissime, omne ab his, qui sunt a Valentino, . . . falsiloquium."

Der entscheidende Auslöser für Irenäus' Werk lag offensichtlich in dem Auffinden von schriftlichen Zeugnissen der Gegner.[25] Er kann nun der an ihn gerichteten Bitte Folge leisten, die bislang verborgenen Lehren ans Licht zu ziehen.[26] In seinem Fund sieht er ein Geschenk der Gnade Gottes (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ).[27] Nach Irenäus' Worten zu urteilen, war es sehr schwierig, originale Dokumente zu erhalten; sei es durch Zufall, sei es durch planmäßige Suche war es Irenäus aber gelungen, Texte (ὑπομνήματα) von Leuten zu finden, die sich als Valentin-Schüler ausgaben;[28] er habe (dann) mit einigen dieser Schüler persönlichen Kontakt aufgenommen und ihre Ansichten (auch mündlich) kennengelernt. Nun fühle er sich verpflichtet (ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην), die entdeckten Lehren der Öffentlichkeit mitzuteilen. Dieses Anliegen der Bekanntmachung ist ihm so wichtig, daß er seinen (namenlosen) Adressaten[29] sogar auffordert, seinerseits dies fortzuführen (ὅπως καὶ σὺ μαθὼν αὐτὰ πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ σοῦ φανερὰ ποιήσῃς).[30] Denn Irenäus ist überzeugt, daß allein die Kenntnis der für ihn abstrusen Lehren deren Widerlegung bedeutet (1,31,3):

> adversus eos victoria est sententiae eorum manifestatio.
> Der Sieg über sie besteht in der Offenlegung ihrer Lehre.

Aus dieser Interpretation ergibt sich, daß der Systementwurf, den Irenäus in den Kapiteln 1-9 bietet, aus schriftlichen Aufzeichnungen von Personen

---

[25] Anders Williams (A. 21), 45: "For Irenaeus is not really trying to show us what 'gnosticism' is, but what *heresy* is"; ich meine, richtiger wäre: "what Valentinian heresy is"; der Ketzerkatalog im dritten Teil soll lediglich die Wurzeln der Valentinianer aufdecken.

[26] Iren. haer. 3 prooem.: "Tu quidem, dilectissime, praeceperas nobis, ut eas quae a Valentino sunt sententias absconditas, ut ipsi putant, in manifestum proderem . . ."

[27] Von dem Adressaten seines Werkes behauptet Irenäus, er habe schon lange (und bisher vergeblich) die Lehren der Valentinianer kennenlernen wollen (haer. 1 prooem. 3). Ebenso hätten seine Vorgänger (Justin und Polykarp?) die valentinianischen Lehren nicht gekannt (haer. 4 prooem. 2).

[28] Es scheint nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß der Presbyter Florinus dabei eine gewisse Rolle spielte. In seiner Jugend sah Irenäus ihn in Kleinasien im Umkreis Polykarps; später muß Florinus valentinianische Lehren vertreten haben (s. Eus. H.E. 5,20); daß er selbst zu den "Schülern Valentins" gehört, kann man nicht annehmen, da Irenäus in seinem Brief an Florinus diesen von den "Häretikern außerhalb der Kirche" unterscheidet (H.E. 5,20,4); die "Schüler Valentins" standen für Irenäus sicherlich "außerhalb der Kirche".

[29] Nach G. Vallée, *A study in anti-Gnostic polemics*, Waterloo/Ontario 1981, 10 sei der Adressat fiktiv (gemeint sei die von den Häretikern verstörte Gemeinde). Wanke (A. 17), 236 lokalisiert ihn dagegen in Rom (evtl. der Presbyter und spätere Episcopus Viktor).

[30] Vgl. 1,15,5 (Z. 15-17) πειρασόμεθα . . . τὰ πολλῷ χρόνῳ κεκρυμμένα εἰς φανερὸν ἀγαγεῖν und 1,18,1 (Z. 9f.) ἀναγκαῖον μηνύσαντας τὸν ἔλεγχον αὐτοῖς ἐπάγειν.

stammt, die sich selbst als "Schüler Valentins" bezeichneten.[31] Die Zuverlässigkeit dieser Angabe betont er ausdrücklich: "wie sie selbst sagen" (ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν). Daß Irenäus aus ihm vorliegenden Texten exzerpiert, wird besonders in Kap. 8,5 deutlich: αὐταῖς λέξεσι λέγοντες οὕτως.[32] Diese "Schüler Valentins" hatten "Erinnerungsschriften" (ὑπομνήματα) angefertigt oder besaßen zumindest solche, ohne sie jedoch zu veröffentlichen.[33] Kenntnisnahme dieser Texte war nur durch persönliche Bekanntschaft möglich.[34] In Irenäus' Falle gelangten solche ὑπομνήματα nun einmal in die "falschen" Hände; er setzt sie einer breiteren Öffentlichkeit aus, um sie lächerlich zu machen. Über die Identität dieser Schüler verrät Irenäus nichts. Dabei gibt es keinen Grund, Irenäus' Angaben zu bezweifeln: Irenäus kann—wohl in Rom (dort weilte er spätestens 177/8 n. Chr., s. Eus. H.E. 5,4,2)—tatsächlich auf Leute gestoßen sein, die Valentins Predigten und Vorträge zwischen 140 und 150 n. Chr. (oder gar später) gehört haben und schriftliche Mitschriften verfaßten oder besaßen.[35] Die Unterscheidung der "Valentin-Schüler" von den "jetzt" tätigen Lehrern muß beachtet werden.[36] Aus ihr folgt erstens, daß die "Valentin-Schüler" keine Lehrer, son-

---

[31] Irenäus' Polemik in Kap. 4,3 legt nahe, daß Valentin wie ein nichtchristlicher Lehrer gegen Bezahlung unterrichtet hat. Vergleichbar sind die "Hypomnemata", die von Herakleons Johannes-Exegese angefertigt wurden, s. Orig. in Joh. 6,15,92; auch hier scheinen die "Schüler" abweichende Lehren notiert zu haben, s. ebd. 13,20,122 und 20,20,170.

[32] Vgl. adv. haer. 1,9,1 αὐτὰς παρεθέμην αὐτῶν τὰς λέξεις.

[33] Eine schöne Parallele gibt es in Porph. vit. Plot. 3 § 18-20: Plotin, Origenes und Herennius verabreden, ihre Unterlagen vom Unterricht des Ammonios Sakkas nicht zu veröffentlichen; Plotin hält sich 10 Jahre an die Verabredung und unterrichtet nur einige Schüler mündlich im Anschluß an Ammonios (ἐκ τῆς Ἀμμωνίου συνουσίας ποιούμενος τὰς διατριβάς); erst nachdem Herennius und Origenes etwas veröffentlicht haben, beginnt Plotin zu schreiben und damit die Lehren des Ammonios öffentlich zu machen.

[34] Vgl. F. Montanari, s.v. Hypomnema, Neuer Pauly 5, 1998, 813: "Die Konnotation 'Notiz privater Natur' rechtfertigt den Gebrauch des Wortes im Sinne einer nicht für die Verbreitung in der Öffentlichkeit bestimmten Schrift, im Gegensatz zu einem veröffentlichten Werk"; vgl. den Zeitgenossen Galen, de libris propriis 92,13-16 (Mueller, Galen Scrip. min. II) φίλοις γὰρ ἢ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδοτο (Subj.: meine Schriften) χωρὶς ἐπιγραφῆς ὡς ἂν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἔκδοσιν ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις γεγονότα δεηθεῖσιν, ὧν ἤκουσαν, ἔχειν ὑπομνήματα, dazu E. Nachmanson, *Der gr. Buchtitel*, Göteborg 1941, 25: "Manche Aufzeichnungen wurden nur als ὑπομνήματα zu Papier gebracht, waren aber nur für die ἑταῖροι bestimmt, nicht für eine größere Leserschaft".

[35] Eine moderne Parallele: I. Schudoma hat ab 1978 ihre Mitschriften der Vorlesungen von W. Schadewaldt, die er seit 1950 in Tübingen hielt, veröffentlicht.

[36] Die "Anhänger des Ptolemaios" (Kap. 12,1) zählt Irenäus zu den "jetzt" Lehrenden (als solche werden sie im zweiten Teil behandelt), nicht aber zu der Gruppe der "Schüler" Valentins, von denen er Schriften erhielt; anders C. Markschies, Art. Valentinus, Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 621: "Offenbar fand eine starke Umprägung der Lehre des V.

dern Anhänger des Valentin waren—und sich auch so nannten—und als solche Schriften besaßen, in deren Besitz Irenäus gelangt war. Den einen oder anderen von ihnen (möglicherweise war es auch nur einer) hat Irenäus sogar noch befragen können. Es folgt zweitens, daß die Lehren, die Irenäus in den ersten Kapiteln vorträgt, nicht auf Ptolemaios und seine Schule zurückgeführt werden dürfen.[37] Der nur in der lateinischen Übersetzung überlieferte Satz: "et Ptolemaeus quidem ita" (8,5) ist ebenfalls als Glosse anzusehen und stellt den ersten Beleg für das Mißverständnis des von Irenäus Gemeinten dar. Er ist zu athetieren und nicht seinerseits in das bei Epiphanios überlieferte griechische Original des Irenäus einzutragen.[38] Es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß ein und derselbe Tradent sowohl im Prooimion als auch hier den Namen des Ptolemaios hinzugesetzt hat, um sowohl die "jetzt Falsches Lehrenden" als auch die "Schüler Valentins" näher zu identifizieren.[39] Wie den späteren Auslegern ist ihm dabei allerdings entgangen, daß es sich dabei in Wahrheit um zwei verschiedene Gruppen handelt. Was Irenäus über Ptolemaios (und seine Anhänger) zu sagen hat, steht allein in Kap. 12,1—und das ist bedauerlich wenig und nicht besonders auffällig.[40] So kann man auch im Blick auf den einzig

---

. . . in der 'Schule des Ptolemaeus' bei röm. Gnostikern statt, die sich selbst 'Schüler des V.' nannten."

[37] Statt vieler Namen, die das System Ptolemaios zuschreiben, sei nur F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose valentinienne*, Paris 1947, 227-232 genannt; neuerdings etwas abgewandelt bei W.A. Löhr, Art. Ptolemäus, TRE 27, 1997, 700: "Bei Irenäus, haer. I,1-9 findet sich . . . ein Entwurf der Heilsgeschichte, den Irenäus auf die *Umgebung* des Ptolemaios . . . zurückführt" (kursiv von mir); vgl. Markschies (A. 36), 620: "Iren. haer. I 1,1-8,4 (Ptolemaeus-Schule, nicht Ptolemaeus)", Wanke (A. 17), 211: "Lehrmeinungen der Ptolemäer". Nicht Valentin, auch nicht sein Schüler, sondern die Schüler des Schülers sind für den ketzerischen Mythos verantwortlich! Hier wird die altkirchliche Idee einer "reinen" Frühzeit auf die Spitze getrieben.

[38] Vgl. Wanke (A. 17), 211 A. 51: "Bei dem Schlußsatz von Iren. haer. 1,8,5 . . . dürfte es sich um eine redaktionelle Glosse handeln"; anders z.B. C. Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?*, Tübingen 1992, 365 A. 219: "Diese Worte gehören aber sicher zum originalen Irenäus-Text" und Rousseau (A. 1), 218. Der Versuch, den Satz allein auf die Johannes-Exegese in Kap. 8,5 (so z.B. Löhr [A. 37], 700) scheitert m.E. an dem Plural der Einleitung (διδάσκουσιν); damit kann doch nicht Ptolemaios gemeint sein.

[39] Man muß dann annehmen, daß sich beide Ergänzungen schon in Epiphanius' Vorlage fanden; die Glosse in Kap. 8,5 hat Epiphanios weggelassen (evtl. besaß er eine andere Handschrift ohne dieselbe), weil er Irenäus' ersten Teil im Kap. 31 über Valentin ausschreibt, Ptolemaios aber erst zwei Kapitel später behandelt.

[40] Dieser Text ist von der Forschung aber zumeist übersehen worden (s. dazu A. 45); in seinen beiden Ptolemaios-Artikeln hat ihn z.B. Löhr nicht einmal genannt (TRE 27, 1997, 699-702 und Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 527f.). Irenäus nennt Ptolemaios an nur drei weiteren Stellen seines Werkes: 2,4,1: "die Äonen des Ptolemaios und Herakleon", 2,25,5: Ptolemaios hat die Apostel nie gesehen, nicht einmal im Traum, 2,28,9: Valentin,

erhaltenen originalen Text, Ptolemaios' "Brief an Flora", urteilen, daß die Bedeutung dieses Valentin-Schülers nicht in der besonderen Gestalt seiner Lehren, sondern m.E. in erster Linie in seinem Martyrium lag (s. A. 20). Erst der gewaltsame Tod macht den "Häretiker" berühmt (wenn auch von der Mehrheitskirche aus begreiflichen Gründen übergangen), so daß ein Glossator die "Falschlehrer" und "Schüler Valentins" mit ihm und seiner Schule gleichsetzt. Damit erhält Ptolemaios allerdings eine Bedeutung, die ihm in der Entwicklung des Valentianismus aller Wahscheinlichkeit nach nicht zukam.

Aus der vorgetragenen Analyse des Vorworts des ersten Buches von Irenäus Werk "Gegen die Häresien" folgt, daß die in der Forschung übliche Zuweisung des valentinianischen Systems in den Kap. 1-9 an Ptolemaios (oder seine Schule) aufgegeben werden muß. Wenn Irenäus sein Referat mit dem unbestimmten "sie sagen", "sie benennen" etc. einführt, ist als Subjekt zu ergänzen: οἱ μαθηταὶ Οὐαλεντίνου, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν.[41] Wessen Lehren haben die "Schüler Valentins" nun tradiert? Die einfache und naheliegende Antwort: die Lehren Valentins natürlich, muß im Hinblick auf das erhaltene Referat modifiziert werden. Denn die in Kap. 11,1 für Valentin überlieferte Äonenlehre entspricht zwar im wesentlichen der im ersten Kapitel referierten,[42] aber in der Frage der Herkunft Christi habe, wie Irenäus betont, Valentin anderes gelehrt als das in den ersten Kapiteln dargestellte System:[43] Die Sophia habe nach ihrem Fall Christus hervorgebracht, der aber habe sie verlassen und sei ins Pleroma aufgestiegen. Diese Lehre wird außerdem für Theodot (32,2f., vgl. 23,2) und in der

---

Ptolemaios und Basilides gäben vor, die Tiefen Gottes erforscht zu haben. Alle drei Stellen sind ganz allgemein gehalten und verraten nichts über Ptolemaios und seine Lehre.

[41] Irenäus nennt im gesamten ersten Teil seine Gewährsmänner stets in der 3. Pers. Plural (λέγουσιν, ὀνομάζουσιν, καλοῦσιν, φάσκουσιν, θέλουσιν κτλ.); allein dies verbietet es, das System Ptolemaios (etwa im Gegensatz zu seinen Schülern) zuzuteilen.

[42] Vgl. Markschies (A. 38), 369: "... Irenäus (stellte) hier lediglich eine etwas variierte Zusammenfassung von Haer. I 1,1 an den Anfang des Valentin-Referates". Ebenso ist die Angabe, Valentin habe zwei Horoi gelehrt, gut mit dem System in Kap. 1-9 vereinbar.

[43] Iren. adv. haer. 1,11,1: Christus sei nicht von den Äonen des Pleroma emaniert worden (so Kap. 2,6), sondern von der aus dem Pleroma ausgeschlossenen Mutter (ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἔξω γενομένης). Die Emanation des aufsteigenden Christus entspricht der Lehre von der Verdoppelung der Sophia (oder der Teilung des Logos in Trac. Trip. NHC I,5, 78,1ff.): der geistige Teil geht ins Pleroma, das übrige bleibt außerhalb. Insofern ist die genannte Mutter die äußere Sophia, die Enthymesis oder Achamoth, von der adv. haer. 1,2,5 gesagt wird: ἀφορισθῆναι ταύτην ἐκτὸς τοῦ Πληρώματος τῶν Αἰώνων, zum Titel "Mutter" für die untere Sophia s. Kap. 4,5, 5,1, 5,2 u.ö.

"Expositio Valentiniana" aus NHC XI,1 bezeugt.[44] Die Frage, ob sie tatsächlich von Valentin stammt, soll nicht entschieden werden; hier geht es darum, daß Irenäus zwischen Valentin und den "Hypomnemata" der "Schüler Valentins" in einem bestimmten Detail eine Differenz betont. Damit stellt sich noch einmal die Frage, wessen Lehren es dann sind, die die "Schüler Valentins" überliefert haben. Eine Antwort darauf bleibt uns der Kirchenvater schuldig. Er hat es unterlassen, eine Verbindung zwischen den beiden ersten Teilen seines Buches herzustellen. Er sagt seinem Leser nicht, wie es zu erklären sei, daß die "Schüler Valentins" in ihren "Hypomnemata" anderes tradieren, als Valentin selbst gelehrt habe. Aber auch keine andere der im zweiten Teil referierten Richtungen ist mit dem zuerst dargestellten System (und seinen Varianten) deckungsgleich.[45] Die Lehren der Kapitel 1-9 werden von Irenäus historisch nicht lokalisiert. Sie stellen für ihn gleichsam ein Grundgerüst valentinianischer Lehren dar (in haer. 4 praef. 2 nennt er es "regula"); dem Eindruck aber, dieses System sei so etwas wie ein valentinianischer Konsens, möchte er dadurch entgegentreten, daß er sogar dem Gründer schon eine abweichende Position unterstellt; so kann er seine These von der Unbeständigkeit der Valentinianer untermauern. Irenäus erreicht auf diese Weise sein Ziel, einerseits einen für alle Valentinianer zutreffenden Umriß zu geben, andererseits die Unterschiedlichkeit ihrer Lehren zu beweisen.

Der Interpret kann sich damit nicht zufrieden geben; denn die Texte der "Schüler Valentins" müssen ja einen bestimmten geistigen Urheber gehabt haben. Dabei können die "Schüler Valentins" neben Valentin selbst

---

[44] Ebenso findet sich in Clem. exc. Thdt. 33,3 die Angabe, daß die Sophia nach Christi Aufstieg den Demiurgen hervorgebracht habe (Iren. haer. 1,11,1).

[45] Auch nicht mit der des Ptolemaios und seiner Schule: von ihnen referiert Irenäus (haer. 1,12,1), der oberste Gott habe das erste Äonenpaar (Nus und Wahrheit) durch zwei διαθέσεις hervorgebracht: durch Denken (ἔννοια) und Wollen (θέλησις oder θέλημα), vgl. dazu Corp. Herm. Ascl. 26: "Und er denkt und will nur Gutes. Dies ist Gott . . .". Denken und Wollen sind keine Äonen, sondern (kreative) Geisteszustände des höchsten Gottes; daraus folgt, daß Gott hier ohne einen weiblichen Partner gedacht wird (so z.B. in Tract. Trip. und Ev. Verit.); dies stimmt allenfalls mit System B überein, das Irenäus in Kap. 2,4 erwähnt, nicht aber mit System A, das in der Regel Ptolemaios zugeschrieben wird. Daß die Äonen aus Gottes Denken und Wollen hervorgehen, paßt übrigens nicht zu Tertullians Nachricht, Ptolemaios habe die Äonen nicht als Gedanken, Affekte und Bewegungen Gottes, sondern als eigenständige Wesen ("personales substantiae") außerhalb Gottes verstanden (Val. 4,2); vielleicht ist damit aber auch lediglich gemeint, daß bei Ptolemaios Gott als Monas ohne Paargenossin neben den anderen Äonen-Syzygien steht; anders W.A. Löhr, La doctrine de Dieu dans la lettre à Flora de Prolémée, RHPhR 75, 1995, 178f.

(s.o.) auch andere valentinianische Lehrer gehört haben. Diese Pluralität legt das erhaltene Exzerpt nahe. Denn aus ihm wird deutlich, daß Irenäus im ersten Teil verschiedene (mindestens zwei) Fassungen des Mythos verarbeitet hat (üblicherweise mit A und B bezeichnet): Er erwähnt in Kap. 2,3-4 die Fassung des Mythos, die Hippolyt im sog. gnostischen Sondergut vorfand.[46] Im zweiten Teil werden dann weitere Varianten (vornehmlich zur Äonenlehre und Christologie) genannt. Welche Gestalt hatten also die dem Irenäus vorliegenden Hypomnemata? Was Irenäus' Umgang mit seiner Quelle angeht, so konnte DIBELIUS zeigen, daß dieser die valentinianischen Schriftbelege aus ihrem ursprünglichen Kontext getrennt und, nach NT und AT geordnet, zusammengestellt hat.[47] In analoger Weise bietet sich als Hypothese an, daß in Irenäus' Quelle die unterschiedlichen Varianten valentinianischer Lehren in die Darstellung des Hauptstranges des Mythos (die Fassung A) eingearbeitet waren.[48] Ob dies in einem einzigen Hypomnema geschehen war, oder ob Irenäus, wie der von ihm benutzte Plural nahelegt, diese Varianten in zwei oder sogar mehreren "Erinnerungsschriften" vorfand, ist dabei von untergeordneter Bedeutung. Wahrscheinlich waren die vorhandenen Varianten zu großen Teilen auch ohne die Angabe ihres geistigen Urhebers notiert; dies würde am besten erklären, warum Irenäus so selten konkrete Namen nennt.[49] Nach dieser Hypothese hat Irenäus einen Teil dieser Varianten bereits in den Kapiteln 1-9 verarbeitet (dort stets ohne die Angabe eines bestimmten Lehrers) und aus den übrigen Abweichungen, die er in seinem Material vorfand, seinen zweiten Teil gebildet (unter Hinzunahme weiterer Quellen über Markos);[50] in diesem zweiten Teil hat er die in seiner Quelle erwähnten Varianten z. T. bestimmten Lehrern (Valentin, Sekundos, Ptolemaios' Schule) zugeordnet, die meisten aber auch hier ohne eine Namensangabe referiert.[51] So erklärt

---

[46] Ab Kap. 2,3 benutzt Irenäus eine neue Quelle (B, s. Hipp. ref. 6,29ff.); er leitet sie mit den Worten ein: ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν οὕτως τὸ πάθος τῆς Σοφίας καὶ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν μυθολογοῦσιν. In 2,4 nennt er den entscheidenden Unterschied der beiden Fassungen A und B: nach A besitzt der höchste Gott eine weibliche Paargenossin, in B ist er allein.

[47] Vgl. oben S. 2; O. Dibelius, Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer I, ZNW 9, 1908, 230.

[48] Eine gewisse Parallele bietet sich in Hipp. ref. 6,37,8, wo ein Text Valentins von einem unbekannten Valentinianer kommentiert wird.

[49] Vergleichbar sind in dieser Hinsicht Clemens' "Exzerpte aus Theodot": nur fünfmal wird Theodot namentlich genannt (sechsmal: "er sagt"), zehnmal dagegen: "die Valentinianer sagen", und sechszehnmal "sie sagen".

[50] Zumindest die Kapitel 17,1-2 und 18,1-20,3 beweisen, daß Irenäus auch im zweiten Teil Material aus der Quelle des ersten Teils benutzt hat; s. oben S. 2.

[51] Weshalb er Herakleon, den er einmal in adv. haer. 2,4,1 neben Ptolemaios nennt,

sich auch, warum er in Kap. 11,3 Markos' Lehren bespricht, ohne seinen Namen zu erwähnen, und seine Identität erst in Kap. 15,1 aus einer anderen Quelle als den "Hypomnemata der Schüler Valentins" nachreicht. Wie zuverlässig seine Zuordnungen bestimmter Lehren an bestimmte Personen sind, muß unsicher bleiben. Möglicherweise fand er sie in seiner schriftlichen Quelle vor; sie können aber auch auf mündlicher Information beruhen oder gar Irenäus' eigene Erfindung darstellen. So teilt er z.B. die drei ihm vorliegenden Lehren über die Herkunft Jesu' (aus dem Äon Theletos, aus Christus oder aus dem Äonenpaar Anthropos und Ekklesia) kurzerhand alle Valentin selbst zu (Kap. 11,1). Allein die Triplizität der Lehren läßt Zweifel daran entstehen, ob wirklich Valentin ihr Urheber ist.[52] In gleicher Weise hat er die oben besprochene christologische Sonderlehre Valentin zugeschrieben; wie zuverlässig dies angesichts des ihm vorliegenden Materials ist, kann, wie gesagt, schwer beurteilt werden.

Die Analyse führt zu einem Ergebnis, das erstaunliche Ähnlichkeit mit unserem Wissensstand bezüglich der valentinianischen Nag-Hammadi-Schriften hat. Wir wissen (mit unterschiedlicher Sicherheit), daß es sich um valentinianische Lehren handelt, aber wir haben keine zuverlässigen Informationen, von wem sie stammen. Seinen Grund mag dies im Selbstverständnis der Valentinianer finden. Nicht die Persönlichkeit eines individuellen Lehrers, sondern die durch den Offenbarer geschenkte Erkenntnis steht im Vordergrund. So bleiben viele Texte und Lehren bewußt anonym (oder pseudonym), weil sie sich allein als Auslegung der göttlichen Offenbarung verstehen.[53] Der überhöhte Wahrheitsanspruch drängt die historische Bedingtheit in den Hintergrund. Insofern kann die Analyse für den heutigen Forscher nur unbefriedigend bleiben, wenn er gerade die

---

im ersten Buch nicht erwähnt, muß offen bleiben. War er in den "Hypomnemata" nicht genannt? Origenes nennt Herakleon übrigens nicht "mit Reserve" (so C. Markschies, Art. Herakleon, Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 281) Valentins Schüler; der Text lautet (in Joh. 2,14,100): βιαίως δὲ οἶμαι καὶ χωρὶς μαρτυρίου τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα διηγούμενον τὸ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἐξειληφέναι πάντα τὸν κόσμον κτλ. "Ich glaube, daß Herakleon, der Valentins Schüler genannt wird (s. Clem. strom. 4,71,1), hat gewaltsam und ohne Beweis, als er 'alles entstand durch ihn' auslegte, 'alles' als Kosmos verstanden . . ." βιαίως καὶ χωρὶς μαρτυρίου kann sich seiner Stellung nach nicht auf λεγόμενον beziehen.

[52] Vgl. Markschies (A. 38), 373: "(Der dritte Abschnitt) besteht im Grunde nur aus drei alternativen Erklärungen der Entstehung Jesu, die eher bestätigen, daß zwei oder drei Valentinianer etwas Verschiedenes sagen, als Valentins Lehre wiederzugeben."

[53] Auch wird wohl in der Konfrontation mit der Mehrheitskirche die Anonymität oder Pseudonymität als Schutz gewirkt haben.

Geschichtlichkeit der Erkenntnis (Gnosis) untersucht. Auf der anderen Seite kann die Aufhebung der m.E. falschen Zuweisung von Iren. haer. 1-9 an Ptolemaios die Diskussion um die Urheberschaft besonders der Texte aus dem Jung-Codex beleben. Was Irenäus angeht, scheint es mir bedenkenswert zu sein, den Hauptteil der "Nachschriften" der "Schüler Valentins", d.h. die Fassung A des Mythos, Valentin selbst zuzuschreiben, zumindest die groben Linien und die innerliche Struktur. Dies würde auch erklären, warum ein Ausschnitt aus diesem Mythos in den "Exzerpten aus Theodot und den Lehren der östlichen Schule" wiederkehrt. In seiner Quelle für dieses Werk hat Clemens möglicherweise auch ein solches ὑπόμνημα gefunden, das ein Valentin-Schüler (Theodot?) von den Vorträgen seines Lehrers angefertigt hat (Clem. exc. Th. 43,2-65). Die weitgehende Parallelität der Texte würde sich so am zwanglosesten durch den gemeinsamen Ursprung erklären. Was das Schulhaupt dieser wichtigen Bewegung des 2./3. Jhs. angeht, sollte man nicht der Tradition eines Glossators folgen und die Überlieferung gänzlich dem Lehrer absprechen und dem—wohl aus anderen Gründen berühmten—Schüler oder gar erst dessen Schülern zuteilen.

Center for Hellenic Studies
3100 Whitehaven Street NW
Washington DC 20008
holzhaus@zedat.fu-berlin.de

THE RULE OF TRUTH AND IRENAEAN RHETORIC IN BOOK 1 OF *AGAINST HERESIES*

BY

THOMAS C.K. FERGUSON

Introduction: Reappraising Irenaeus

James Joyce once mentioned that it should take his readers as long to read *Finnegan's Wake* as it took him to write it. Much the same can be said of Irenaeus of Lyon's *Against Heresies*: given the scope and length of the work, combined with its author's manner of writing, it does not easily present itself for interpretation. *Against Heresies* is a text which requires close reading as well as strict attention to the larger structure of the work and intentions of its author in order to gain a deeper insight into Irenaeus's purposes and accomplishments. This article proposes to do exactly that: to reassess the place of Book 1 within the overall structure of *Against Heresies*, showing that rather than providing exposition, it functions as the beginning of Irenaeus's refutation of Gnosticism. Such an assessment of Book 1 will show that the Rule of Truth appearing in 1.10, the centerpiece of Irenaeus's entire argument against the Gnostics, is best understood in light of the construction of the systems of Gnostic thought outlined in 1.1-1.9.

It is this precision with which Irenaeus's work must be read which has been the cause of misinterpretation of the bishop's ability as a writer. In the flowering of Patristic studies at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, Irenaeus was faulted for not fitting into the mold of theologian as both Protestant and Catholic scholars imagined.[1]

[1] Reflecting his own understanding of how a theologian should operate, Johannes Quasten wrote of *Against Heresies*: "The whole work suffers from a lack of clear arrangement and unity of thought. Prolixity and frequent repetition make its perusal wearisome ... Evidently he [Irenaeus] did not have the ability to shape his materials into a homogeneous whole. The defects of form which offend the reader are a result of this lack of synthesis (Quasten, *Patrology, Volume I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, 289; Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1950)." From the Protestant side, Adolf von Harnack also faults Irenaeus for not being a systematician: "As we have seen, Irenaeus ... has no strictly systematized theology (Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma, Volume II*, 312; New York: Dover, 1961)."

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

This image of Irenaeus was critiqued by R.M. Grant, who, some fifty years ago, called for a reappraisal of Irenaeus's intelligence. In Grant's words, "Too often we are content with a picture of Irenaeus as orthodox but rather stupid."[2] Irenaeus benefited from a great rehabilitation following Grant's article. No longer interpreted as a witness to the development of dogma or through confessional polemics, there has been a greater awareness, in the words of Irenaean scholar Mary Ann Donovan, that "The literary process structuring the unity of *AH* is not linear, nor is it logically deductive."[3] The work of Philippe Bacq, among others, has shown that Irenaeus did indeed have a system, though it was unlike that of modernity, and presented his understanding of Irenaean method to show the unity of Book IV of *Against Heresies*.[4] In addition, the work of William Schoedel has also shed substantial light on Irenaeus's overall method of composition.[5]

As a result of this renewal in Irenaean studies, Book 1 is seen as the necessary presentation of Gnostic cosmology followed by refutation from both logic and Scripture in Books 2-5. Given the unique nature of Book 1 in comparison with the remaining books, it has been the subject of extensive form-critical study to determine which sections were of Irenaean origin, and which were taken over from various heresiological sources.[6] Book 1 has also had an additional place within the history of scholarship; with its detailed descriptions of Gnostic groups and their teachings, for many years Irenaeus was an invaluable and sometimes sole source for understanding Gnosticism. With the discovery of the Nag Hammadi texts, Book 1 moved into the center of a debate concerning Irenaeus's accuracy as a source for Gnosticism and raised further questions concerning his overall

---

[2] R.M. Grant, "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture, *Harvard Theological Review* 43 (1949), 51.

[3] Mary Ann Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," *Second Century* 4 (1984), 223.

[4] Phillippe Bacq, *De l'ancienne à la nouvelle selon S. Irénée: unité de livre IV de l'Adversus Haereses* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1978).

[5] William R. Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 13 (1959), 27-28. Building upon Grant's work, Schoedel has demonstrated how rhetorical methods undergird Irenaean construction. Schoedel, using methods of rhetorical disputation outlined by Cicero and prevalent in the ancient world, argued that Book 1 is concerned with "the facts of the case, the *narratio*." Books 2-5, in turn, serve as the *confutatio*, or refutation of the premises initially presented.

[6] As best shown in the article by Pheme Perkins, "Irenaeus and the Gnostics: Rhetoric and Composition in *Adversus Haereses* Book One," *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976), 193-200. Responding to the work of Frederik Wisse, Perkins takes into account oral and rhetorical modes of argumentation, arguing for greater Irenaean composition for Book 1 than previously considered, especially 1.29-30. In particular see Perkins, 199.

goals and purposes. Did Irenaeus represent his foes truthfully, or was he only concerned with proving his point?[7] The general consensus now is that Irenaeus was fairly reliable in his transmission of Gnosticism.

Though neither the role of Irenaeus as an historical source nor his worth as a systematic theologian is my focus, nonetheless the preceding synopsis of images of Irenaeus and of Book 1 is significant in that, despite the varied opinions and biases throughout the history of Irenaean study, these writers reflect a common methodological presupposition: as Mary Ann Donovan notes, scholars will find what they are looking for.[8] Asking whether Irenaeus is a systematic theologian or an accurate historical source is inherently flawed, for he aspired to be neither in composing *Against Heresies*. The debates surrounding Irenaeus's accuracy have failed to take into account the internal rhetorical argument, use of language, and intricate structural composition which have been recognized as hallmarks of his method. Far from setting the stage for the refutation, Book 1 is the beginning of that refutation. Accordingly this paper takes the form of a commentary on the first ten chapters of Book 1, to show the layers of construction of the text, culminating in the Rule of Truth in 1.10.

One can see that Book 1 consists primarily of descriptions of Gnostic cosmology and salvation, punctuated in 1.10 and 1.22 by Irenaeus's Rule of Truth (first mentioned in 1.9.4, developed in 1.10 and 1.22). This Rule of Truth has been considered as a form of baptismal creed, though Irenaeus's precise source for it cannot be reconstructed. It is the Rule of Truth that Irenaeus expounds more fully in Books 3-5, supporting his argument with the Hebrew Scriptures, Gospels, and apostolic writings—or, in Irenaean language, the prophets, words of the Lord, and words of the apostles.

It is my contention that the Rule of Truth is conditioned by Irenaeus's presentation of the Gnostic systems outlined in 1.1-8 and 1.11-21. Rather than functioning as the *narratio*, Book 1 is devoted to the beginning of Irenaeus's refutation of the Gnostic systems, with his critique running insep-

---

[7] Elaine Pagels attacked Irenaeus's reliability, first in her article "Conflicting Versions of Valentinian Eschatology: Irenaeus's *Treatise* vs. *Excerpts from Theodosius*," *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974), 35-53, as well as in *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House, 1979). For Pagels Irenaeus's motive was to "'subvert and destroy' the theology of those he considers a threat to the church ("Conflicting Versions of Valentinian Eschatology," 53)." Pagels has in turn been critiqued, most notably by R.M. Grant, "Review of *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis* and *The Gnostic Paul*, by Elaine Pagels," *Religious Studies Review* 3 (1977), 30-34.

[8] Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," 223.

arably parallel to his exposition. Irenaeus lays the groundwork in his Preface, and, through the unfolding of his rhetorical discourse, the Rule of Truth is built upon his descriptions of Gnosticism, and as a refutation is part of a appropriation of Gnostic terminology of salvation and creation. Such an application of recent developments in Irenaean thought to Book 1 is long overdue, and a necessary companion to the work done on Books 2-5.[9]

I. Against Heresies, *Preface to Book 1: Beginnings of Appropriation*

An appreciation of the depth of Irenaeus's understanding and appropriation of Gnosticism is found at the very beginning of his work. In his Preface, Irenaeus sets the stage through modes of argumentation and the development of a theological vocabulary which will become increasingly important in his descriptions of Gnosticism.[10] In typical Irenaean fashion, the wording and turns of phrase in his Preface will be echoed later in the work, pointing back towards the beginning. In Irenaeus's opinion, the Gnostics are to be faulted first and foremost for their flawed methods of reading the Scriptures and for presenting this misinterpretation in their teaching. The image Irenaeus uses to illustrate this methodology comes from a quotation from "one greater than we," of mistaking an authentic, precious stone for a fake constructed from glass. The Gnostics, for Irenaeus, "speak the same language as we do, but intend different meanings."[11] Echoing the language of the Pastoral Epistles, these culprits are like "certain persons (τινες)" who engage in theological speculation.[12] Having estab-

---

[9] Such a study is something Donovan recognized as necessary fifteen years ago: "For example, how would such a study of *AH* I affect the reading of the Gnostic exegesis at 1.9 leading into the section on the Christian faith at 1.10, and the critique of Gnostic systems of redemption at 1.21 leading into the section on the *Regula veritatis* at 1.22?"; Donovan, 223.

[10] Often wrongly identified as "Valentinian" Gnosticism, as identified by Dominic J. Unger's chapter headings in his translation *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 23, 27. This is in spite of the fact that Irenaeus himself specifically notes in 1.8.5 that he is describing Ptolemaean Gnosticism, and that his Valentinian section commences in 1.11.1. The *Sources Chretiennes* edition does not have this confusion; see Adelin Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies* (Paris: Cerf, 1979), 29.

[11] Expressed more pithily in the Greek than Unger's translation: "ὅμοια μὲν (ἡμῖν) λαλοῦντας, ἀνόμοια δὲ φρονοῦντας (*similia quidem nobis loquentes, dissimilia vero sentientes*)," I.Preface.2, SC 264: 22.

[12] 1 Timothy 1.4, quoted in Preface 1, SC 264: 19. The "τινες ἐπεισάγουσι λόγους ψευδεῖς" of Irenaeus are linked with τινες charged with speculation in the Pastorals.

lished a methodological approach, as well as presented illustrative images and Scriptural allusions, Irenaeus addresses his intended audience directly: "You yourself . . . will develop these points, receiving from us, as it were, only the seeds and beginnings. In the broad range of your mind you will reap abundant fruit from our brief statements . . ."[13]

These closing statements contain some of the central elements to the Gnostic systems which Irenaeus is about to present: the language of "seeds" (σπέρματα, *semen*) and of their "bearing abundant fruit."[14] Unger, following upon Rousseau's commentary in the SC text, describes Irenaeus's use of these words as "belonging to the quasi-technical vocabulary of the Gnostics. Irenaeus gathers them together at this place for a clearly ironic purpose."[15] Rousseau and Unger are wrong on both counts. At the core of their underappreciation of Irenaeus, they are following in the tradition that holds Book 1 as primarily an exposition, thus failing to take into account Irenaeus's rhetorical construction. Firstly, despite ambiguity as to what these words may have meant in the overall phenomenon of Gnosticism (which may account for Unger's term "quasi-technical"[16]), in Irenaeus's description of the Gnostics, these terms have very technical meanings. Secondly, to dismiss words so central to his description of Gnosticism as "irony" is a disservice. Rather they are the beginnings of the appropriation of Gnostic discourse which continues throughout 1.1-1.8, reaching a peak in 1.9-1.10

II. *1.1-1.8: Preview of the* Confutatio

Following his introduction Irenaeus begins to describe the Gnostic understanding of the formation of the universe as well as the creation of matter and humanity. Throughout the course of 1.1-1.8, Irenaeus groups his material in large thematic blocks, as others have noted.[17] But to supplement

---

[13] Preface.3; Unger, 22.

[14] πολὺ καρποφορήσεις; *multum fructificabis*; SC 264: 26.

[15] Unger, footnote 23, 130, basically quoting Rousseau: "Irénée les accumule à cet endroit dans une intention manifestement ironique (SC 263: 171)."

[16] Unger's term "quasi-technical" most likely stems from one of two premises: as either part of a polemical unwillingness to concede that Gnosticism had a system at all, or in an attempt to acknowledge the multiformity of Gnosticism, and not willing to acknowledge that one can determine or name anything as truly Gnostic. Either way the use of the term does not do justice to Irenaeus's presentation in Book 1.

[17] For a concise outline of 1.1-9, see Mary Ann Donovan, *One Right Reading? A Guide to Irenaeus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 29-42.

Donovan and the scholarly understanding of 1.1-1.8, it is important to note that there is a consistent thread of critique which runs throughout the section. Furthermore, this critique is not haphazard; these sections are linked with one another and, more importantly, along with the description of the Gnostics, point ahead to 1.9-1.10, the presentation of the Rule of Truth. I accordingly offer the following outline, organized around Irenaeus's unfolding argument:[18]

1.1-2 Gnostic cosmology; the emission of the Aeons

1.3 *Examples of Gnostic exegesis* in support of cosmology

2.1-6 The fall of Sophia, creation of a form of matter, and restoration through Limit/Intention; stabilization of Pleroma

3.1-5 *Examples of Gnostic exegesis* in support of cosmology, fall of Sophia, and creation of Savior

3.6 *First Irenaean interlude*; critique of exegesis

4.1-4.2 Fall of Achamoth and creation of material world

4.3-4 *Second Irenaean interlude*; critique of method

4.5-6.1 Formation of Demiurge/Man and threefold nature of humanity

6.2-4 *Third Irenaean interlude*: accuses Gnostics of insulting members of the church in 6.3, of immoral behavior in 6.4.

7:1-5 Description of threefold nature of humankind.

8.1 Critique of Gnostic exegesis

8.2-5 Examples of Gnostic exegesis.

---

[18] Rather than thematically, for example, as in Donovan's outline.

It is the three Irenaean interludes which will serve as the focus of the following commentary, for it is in these places where Irenaeus inserts his own voice that we can see how he is preparing the reader for the Rule of Truth.

First Interlude: 1.3.6 and the Rule of Truth

This outline highlights the juxtaposition of Irenaeus's description of Gnosticism and their[19] Scriptural exegesis. The outline also provides a sense of the repetition in this portrayal: 1.4.1-4.2, with the description of the fall of Achamoth, recalls the fall of Sophia in 1.2.1-6. The threefold description of creation of humankind is picked up again in 1.7.1-5, with reference to the perfection of the pneumatics and fate of the hylics and psychics. What is especially important in presenting the material in the above fashion is noting the three separate places where Irenaeus breaks into the narrative and offers commentary apart from exegetical critique, what I have called the Irenaean "interludes." It is precisely these three interludes which are crucial in establishing the basis for Irenaeus's critique which follows in Books 2-5.

1.3.6, as the first of these interludes, follows on the heels of Irenaeus's second presentation of Gnostic Scriptural exegesis and recalls the preface to the work. The τοιαῦτα of 1.3.6 and the conclusion of 1.3.4 are the first two uses of the word since Preface.3; these conclusions of Gnostic exegesis are linked with those things promised as the stated goals of the work as a whole. As in the preface, the charge that the Gnostics are at heart falsifying the words of the Scriptures is also repeated. Whereas in the Preface the Gnostics are accused of falsifying the word of the Lord, "῾ραδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου,"[20] in 1.3.6 the same participial construction is used, though the object is different: "῾ραδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις."[21] Given the

---

[19] Here I am self-consciously using the word "they" to describe the Gnostics, as this is Irenaeus's preferred method himself throughout 1.1-1.8. He constantly uses third-person plural verb forms, attempting to present a unified portrait of Gnosticism. As mentioned before, it is only at the end of this description, in 1.8.5, that he reveals he is describing Ptolemaean Gnosticism.

[20] Preface.1; Latin "*falsantes verba Domini*"; SC 264: 18.

[21] 1.3.6, SC 264: 61. Taking Bruno Reynders' *Lexique Comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de L'Adversus Haereses de Saint Irénée*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum orientalium 141, Subsidia 5-6 (Louvain:1954) as a start, and supplementing it with my own textual study (since, invaluable as Reynders is, he does not

similarity in construction and the fact that these are the only two occurrences of this verb, here is a prime example of the Preface to *Against Heresies* providing the building blocks for the construction of Irenaean rhetoric.

The echoes to the opening paragraphs continue. After picking up on the charge of Gnostic falsification, Irenaeus returns to a discussion of the truth. As a result of their teaching the Gnostics are accused of leading the faithful away as captives from the truth: "*in captiuitatem ducunt a veritate/* αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας."[22] The word "truth," (*veritas*/ἀληθεία) has served two distinct functions for Irenaeus. Throughout the Preface Irenaeus showed a concern for the truth. The opening line of the work describes the Gnostics as those "rejecting the truth."[23] Through their deceitful presentations, the Gnostic truth appears truer than "truth itself."[24] Further, he promises to show how "incongruous with the truth their statements are."[25] In the Preface, *veritas*/ἀλήθεια represented the ontological truth of the Christian tradition, which the Gnostics rejected and attempted to substitute with their own. Here, for once, Unger's (and others') capitalization is appropriate:[26] in the Preface Irenaeus is putting forward the understanding that there is the Truth.

Truth functions in a second way for Irenaeus—namely, as the name of one of the Aeons of the Gnostic cosmology, as in 1.1.1, where the Aeon Truth is part of the Pythagorean Tetrad, emitted with Mind. This use of Truth reappears in 1.3.3, just prior to 1.3.6, again in reference to the first Tetrad. Truth thus serves as an apt example of Irenaean methodology in Book 1. Having put forward "the" Truth as a foundational element of his understanding of Christianity—that there is such a thing, and "they" reject it—*veritas*/ἀλήθεια is then presented within its technical function in the Gnostic system (not quasi-technical), and in 1.3.6 the word is reappropri-

---

cross-reference everything), these are the only two times that Irenaeus uses this verb. The parallel was not carried over into the Latin translation; whereas in Preface.1 the verb is "*falsantes*," in 1.3.6 it is rendered "*adulterantes expositiones.*"

[22] SC 264: 62.

[23] "*Quatenus veritatem refutantes*," Greek "Ἐπεὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παραπεμπόμενοί τινες," SC 264: 18.

[24] "*ipsa veritate*/αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας," SC 264: 21.

[25] "*non stantia neque apta veritati*/ἀνάρμοστα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ," SC 264: 24.

[26] Where it is less clear, for instance, is in regards to the word spirit; capitalization in English makes the word into the Holy Spirit, where sometimes it is not clear that is what Irenaeus intends.

ated and used to further Irenaeus's critique. Irenaeus describes those being led into captivity as ones "who do not guard a firm faith in the one Father Almighty and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God." As Unger notes, again following Rousseau's commentary, "We have here the two main beliefs of the Creed."[27] What is lacking is an appreciation for the beginning steps in Irenaeus's argument. In a sense Unger and Rousseau perpetuate the interpretation of Irenaeus which Grant described: by looking solely at the Rule of Truth, to the detriment of analyzing the development of his rhetoric, they fail to appreciate the layers of composition of Book 1.

While correct to point out that 1.3.6 serves as a prelude to the Rule of Truth as presented in 1.10.1, Rousseau and Unger fail to note the crucial Irenaean appropriation of language which, as shown above, is emblematic of his portrayal of the Gnostics. While it is true that this is the first time that "one Father Almighty and one Jesus Christ, the Son of God" appear in the text, it is not the first time that "Father," "Jesus," "Christ," and "Son" have appeared. Irenaeus employs all of these words in 1.1.1-1.3.5. Without going into the details of all of the references, suffice to say that these words each describe an essential element in the Gnostic systems of cosmology and of salvation. In Irenaeus's description, "Father" is name given to the emitter of the Aeons, as in 1.1.1-2, whom the original Duodecad glorify through emitting further Aeons in conjugal partnerships, forming the thirty Aeons of the Pleroma. "Christ" is essential to the Gnostic system as described in 1.2.5. Emitted as a dyad with Holy Spirit, Christ allowed for the stabilization of the Pleroma and subsequent peace which permitted the Aeons to create Savior (a second Christ), as described in 1.2.6. "Son" appears twice in 1.3.3, referring to the Gospel account of the woman with the flow of blood in Irenaeus's description of Gnostic exegesis. Irenaeus, while previewing the Rule of Truth in 1.3.6, also collects terms described by their technical meaning for the Gnostics and presents them as the core of what will be picked up again as the Rule of Truth. Irenaeus has already told us the Gnostics have the same language, just that they mean different things when they speak; the Truth described in the Preface is being linked with the confessed faith of the church as Irenaeus describes it. By taking back the Gnostics' language, 1.3.6 thus forms an essential link in Irenaeus's argument.

---

[27] Unger, footnote 37, 151. See Rousseau, SC 263: 189.

Second Interlude: 1.4.3-4: Variety in Method

Irenaeus returns to his description of the Gnostics in 1.4.1-2, concerned with recounting the fall of Achamoth. The description of the fall and restoration of Achamoth has much in common with that of Sophia as told in 1.2. There is the same longing, a fall into experiencing emotion and passion, and a similar emission of some sort of substance on account of this. It is this emotion, as Irenaeus recounts, that the Gnostics believe was the cause the formation of matter, as described in 1.4.2. This understanding of the origin of matter leads into the second Irenaean interlude in 1.4.3-4, where he displays a different element of his refutation.

In 1.3.6 he began to prepare the reader for the Rule of Truth in 1.10.1. In 1.4.3-4 he previews both a theme and a mode of argumentation which will achieve greater prominence throughout Book 1, stretching into the later books. 1.4.3 marks the first time that Irenaeus notes the diversity of Gnostic teaching: "We have here, then, a great tragedy and a fantasy, as each one of them pompously explains, one this way, another that way." The theme of Gnostic diversity as opposed to the uniformity of Irenaeus's faith will become an increasingly important part of his argument of *Against Heresies*, and it is first sounded here. But one must not immediately interpret the passage solely in such a manner. It is not the multiplicity itself which Irenaeus notes; rather the diversity of teaching and the mystery of the teachings are linked to the economic motive of the Gnostics: teaching for money. Whereas "our Lord" admonished us to "give without pay," the Gnostic teachers teach for pay, and furthermore teach absurd fantasies.

Irenaeus inserts himself into the narrative in 1.4.4: "I myself wish to contribute something to their prolific retinue." "Prolific retinue" is Unger's translation of "*fructificationi eorum*/καρποφορίᾳ αὐτῶν."[28] These words in turn point back to the Preface, where Irenaeus promised his friend he would "reap abundant fruit"[29] from his statements. What follows is a mode of argumentation different from what has appeared up to this point in the work. Having argued for an essential truth in Christianity, Irenaeus now turns to the domain of rhetoric and attempts to confute the Gnostics using their own logic. This rhetorical device is called an *enthymema*, whose goal is "to convince the opponent on grounds that he himself was forced to

[28] SC 264: 70.

[29] "*in multum fructificabis*/πολὺ καρποφορήσεις," SC 264: 26.

accept as true."[30] William Schoedel describes such reasoning by Irenaeus in Book 2 of the *Against Heresies*; here we have use of the same form of argumentation in Book 1. Having described the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter, Irenaeus then proceeds on the basis of that description to show its untenable nature. Waters of all kind had its formation from Achamoth's tears (1.4.2).[31] Irenaeus's response takes this literal understanding on its own terms and exploits the logical inconsistencies inherent within it: How could all kind of waters be formed from her tears, since some water is fresh and some is salty? Irenaeus carries this argument to its absurd extremes, leaving unsaid the origin of "hot and pungent" waters.

Such an argument from logic comes to the fore in Book 2. For example in 2.12 Irenaeus, building upon his description of the pairs of Aeons, brings out the contradictions within the system itself. Commenting upon the names given to the Aeons, Irenaeus wonders how can Silence exist concurrently with Word (2.12.5); the two would seem mutually exclusive by their very definition. As Donovan notes, Irenaeus exploits "the literal application of the analogy of human thought to the emission of the Aeons."[32] Irenaeus does so, however, in a manner first introduced in 1.4.4 and echoing his words from the Preface. The rhetorical construction is the same as in 1.3.6, building upon coded language, to provide the same goal, a preview of future confutation. It is the method of refutation previewed which differs, witnessing to the dense layers of Irenaean textual construction.

Third Interlude: 1.6.2-4: Right Conduct and the Church

Following this second interlude, Irenaeus picks up his description where he left off, concerning himself with creation. He describes the Gnostic understanding of the role of the Demiurge, of creation in 5.1-6, and different classes of persons in 6.1. This leads into Irenaeus's third break from his description of the Gnostics in 6.2-4. As we have seen Irenaeus has followed his description of the Gnostics with different modes of refutation. 6.2-4 functions in the same manner. His description of the three classes of persons allows him to contrast the moral behavior of his own church and of the Gnostics. Noting that the Gnostics believe that the "ensouled

---

[30] As described by William R. Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus*," 28.

[31] "*a lacrimis enim eius factam universam umidam substantiam*/ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν δακρύων αὐτῆς γεγονέναι πᾶσαν ἔνυγρον οὐσίαν," SC 264: 66-67.

[32] Donovan, *One Right Reading*, 51.

(*psychici*/ψυχικοί) persons are disciplined by ensouled measures . . . they claim that we of the church are these persons (1.6.2)." This accusation, put in the mouths of the Gnostics, represents the first time that Irenaeus has used the word church in a self-referential manner. The word has appeared twice previously. The first occurrence, in 1.2.6, described the rejoicing of the Aeons, wherein the conjugal pairs adopted the characteristics of each other: "the female Aeons all became Truths and Lives and Spirits and Churches." The second use of the word comes in 1.5.6, where church is described as the spiritual man, the result of the seed planted by Achamoth in Demiurge, and an "antitype of the church on high."

Irenaeus is able to accomplish two tasks in 6.2-4. First, he is able to reappropriate the last piece of the Rule of Truth that will follow in 1.10. Having already redefined "Father," and "Christ" from the Gnostic understanding, Irenaeus takes the word church and applies it to his own group of Christians. Up to this point the Gnostics and their teachers have been portrayed as very much "in the family,"[33] functioning within the Christian community. Furthermore Irenaeus has shown both the role of the Aeon "Church" within their system as well as their understanding of the offspring of Achamoth as representing a type of Church located within the Pleroma. In his accusations against the Gnostics in 1.6.2, Irenaeus first defines his group of Christians within Lugdunum as "the church."[34] Second, 1.6.3-4 allows Irenaeus to present the first of many future *ad hominem* arguments in the *Against Heresies*. In this one, Irenaeus attacks the Gnostics on moral grounds, accusing them of licentiousness (which would become the standard charge against deviant groups),[35] derived from his interpretation of their understanding of the spiritual versus ensouled Christians.

Thus the three Irenaean interludes from 1.1-1.8 follow similiar patterns of argumentation, namely, an appropriation of Gnostic terms and concepts, combined with a of preview three different Irenaean forms of confutation: the Rule of Truth, the enthymema, and the *ad hominem*.

---

[33] Arguing for evidence of diversity within the church of Lyons, Donovan writes: "Furthermore the mythological material gives indications that the Valentinians exist within the Christian community . . . Their presence, as it were, 'in the family,' would be of immense concern to a man like Irenaeus," Donovan, *One Right Reading*, 32.

[34] SC 264: 92-93: "*qui sumus ab Ecclesia*/εἶναι δὲ τούτους ⟨τοὺς⟩ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡμᾶς." Once again Unger, following Rousseau, chooses to capitalize "Church" and, in this instance, capturing rightly Irenaeus's intent to limit this definition to his group.

[35] For a tracing of this motif throughout both Christian and Jewish constructions of heresiology, see Shaye J.D. Cohen, "A Virgin Defiled" Some Rabbinic and Christian Views on the Origins of Heresy, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36 (1980), 1-11.

III. *1.8.1-1.9.5: Preparation for the Rule of Truth*

Having shown the diversity of his argumentation and preparation for the Rule of Truth, 1.8.1 marks a break from Irenaeus's pattern of construction and provides him with an opportunity to summarize his work up to this point. Commencing with one of his marking words, τοιαύτης, Irenaeus presents the system[36] outlined as one "which neither the prophets preached, nor the Lord taught, nor the apostles handed down," expressing typically Irenaean understanding of the threefold division of the Scriptures. 1.8.1 serves as a more expanded critique of Gnostic exegesis than that offered in 1.3.6 by returning to the pattern outlined in the Preface. The key phrase concerns the "words of the Lord." In Preface.1, Irenaeus accused the Gnostics of falsifying the words of the Lord to lead away the ignorant. In 1.8.1, the Gnostics "deceive many by the badly composed fantasy of the Lord's words they adapt." As in the preface, Irenaeus offers an illustration of Gnostic exegesis, arguing that it is analogous to rearranging the stones of a mosaic, transforming the image of a king into that of a dog or a fox. This in turn calls to mind the illustration given in Preface.2; the "precious stone" which the glass imitation mocks is paralleled by the "precious gems" which make up the mosaic.[37] The skillful artisan of the mosaic is likewise paralleled in Preface.2, where the presence of one "skillful" is enough to expose the false glass gem, as well as the copper joined to silver.[38] Furthermore, whereas in Preface.1 Irenaeus quotes 1 Timothy 1.4 at the beginning, he returns to the same letter, quoting 1 Timothy 4.7 at the conclusion of 1.8.1. Through language, illustration, and Scriptural quotation, 1.8.1 mirrors the Preface.

Accordingly 1.8.2-5 summarize Gnostic exegesis, organized around the thematic exposition of 1.1.1-1.7.5. 1.8.2-4 provides examples of Gnostic exegesis in support of their doctrines of the three groups of persons, the descent of Achamoth, and the passions of Sophia. 1.8.5 concludes this chapter with a lengthy description of Gnostic exegesis of the Prologue to

---

[36] The technical term applied here is *argumentum*/ὑπόθεσις (SC 264: 112) which echoes the description given in 1.4.4.

[37] "ex gemmis pretiosis," 1.8.1, SC 264: 114; compare "*lapidem pretiosum*" of Preface. 2, SC 264: 20.

[38] Compare the "*a sapiente artifice*/ὑπὸ σοφοῦ τεχνίτου" who creates the image in 1.8.1 (SC 264: 114) and the one who tests and exposes in Preface.2, "*probare et artificium arguere*/δοκιμάσαι καὶ τέχνην διελέγξαι," SC 264: 20-21.

the Gospel of John in support of the primary Ogdoad. Of these descriptions, 1.8.5 is particular important for investigating 1.9.

1.9.1-5 serves as a bridge from Irenaeus's description of Gnosticism and the introduction of the major themes of 1.10-1.22, and in doing so employs a chiastic form of argumentation for the first time. Beginning with a short summary preface, Irenaeus begins to present the conclusions of the opening chapters of the work. He addresses his intended reader, "my dear friend," for the first time since the Preface.[39] Having promised an exposition and description to his friend, in 1.9.1 he announces that he has done so, describing the preceding chapters as presenting the "method" (employing a technical term, *adinventio*/μέθοδος) of the Gnostics. There are the same repeated charges of "fabricating" the Scriptures, but with a slight twist. Rather than deceiving the faithful, the Gnostics actually "deceive themselves."

Irenaeus then seeks to prove how those whom he has previously described as deceiving others deceive themselves, and the chiastic form of argumentation follows, with its centerpiece an exegesis of the Prologue to John, appropriating the text from the Gnostics.

Outline of the Chiasm:

1.9.1[40]: The enthymema: argument confuting premises established by Gnostic exegesis.

1.9.2: Exegesis of John's Prologue, counterpoint to Gnostic exegesis of 1.8.5.

1.9.3: Dogmatic implications based on premises established through proper exegesis.

Marking separation between his summary and the chiasm with the disjunctive "*primo*/πρῶτον," Irenaeus constructs his logical argument in two parts. With devastating simplicity, Irenaeus asks: if John had intended to portray the Gnostic doctrine of the divine Ogdoad, then why are they not mentioned in the gospel? In the second place, if understanding that the Aeons were emitted in pairs is so essential, then why, if John mentions "man" in his Prologue, does he not mention Man's conjugal partner, "church?" His painstaking enumeration of the Aeons and inclusion of Gnostic exegesis in 1.8.5 is in order to provide the logical ground for its refutation.

---

[39] "*dilectissime*/ἀγαπητέ," first appearing in Preface.2, SC 264, 22, and appearing again SC 264: 136-37.

[40] Beginning in line 6 of the SC text; SC 264: 136.

The middle and third sections of the chiasm are marked off by emphatic *igitur*/οὖν constructions; in 1.9.2, "*manifesta igitur*/φανερὰ οὖν." In 1.9.2 Irenaeus seeks to explain the plain words of the text, referring to the "one God almighty and one only begotten Jesus Christ," echoing his statements in 1.3.6. In the construction of their alternative language, the Gnostics take the words to mean something which they do not. They "misuse the names and transfer them to their own system." In Irenaeus's first extensive biblical exegesis (previous exegesis up to this point has consisted of Gnostic examples), the Prologue of John's gospel is reclaimed for "the truth."

In the third section of the chiasm, beginning in 1.9.3, Irenaeus provides an exhortation, building upon his refutation and his exegesis to begin the construction of dogmatic principles which will lead into the Rule of Truth. The *igitur*/οὖν is here combined with the imperative *discite*/μάθετε, and the "foolish people," presumably the Gnostics but perhaps also those who have been led astray, are admonished that "Jesus who suffered for us, who dwelt among us, this very same one is the Word of God." The terms "Jesus" and "Logos" have, up to this point, been part of the Gnostic system. Irenaeus combines these terms to show how Scripture should be rightly interpreted. This exhortation is linked to the first section of the chiasm in 1.9.1 through similiar logical argumentation, namely, that if it was to be through an Aeon, or an Ogdoad, that we would be saved, then John would have written that in the Gospel. As in 1.9.1, in 1.9.3 Irenaeus tells us that the Gnostic interpretation is simply not supported by the words of Scripture.

1.9.4 provides an alternative illustration of this Gnostic process of rearrangement of Scripture, complementing those of Preface.2 and 1.8.1. Departing from his physical, artistic imagery, Irenaeus brushes off his rhetorical skills uses a metaphor taken from Homer. The purpose of the example, however, is the same: just as a skillful person can expose the glass fake for the gem, so can someone who knows Homer well put the verses back into their proper arrangement. The reason for moving from a physical image to an example from the written word is that Irenaeus's immediate purpose is literary rather than purely illustrative: the example from Homer leads directly into the first mention of the Rule of Truth in the middle of 1.9.4:

> In the same way, anyone who keeps unchangeable in himself the rule of truth received through baptism will recognize the names and sayings and parables from the Scriptures, but this blasphemous scheme of theirs he will not recognize.

In his introduction of the Rule of Truth, Irenaeus is building upon the linguistic and methodological work of the preceding chapters of *Against*

Heresies. The word truth has moved from being an element of the Gnostic system, while referring to the ontological truth of the Christian Church, to the truth received by the faithful at baptism. Likewise the "scheme" of the Gnostics, the *argumentum*/ὑπόθεσις of 1.8-1.9, can be vanquished through proper methodology, illustrated through his Homeric image, and buttressed by his return to the metaphor of the king and the mosaic. Forming an *inclusio* with 1.8.1, the one who keeps the faith will not be deceived by the Gnostics, but will recognize the king for the king, not the fox. Language and methodology come together in 1.8.1-1.9.4.

IV. *The Rule of Truth: The Culmination of the* Narratio

Irenaeus moves into his formulation of the Rule of Truth in 1.9.5. Separating this section from 1.9.1-4, Irenaeus employs theatrical terminology: "Since an ending is lacking to this drama,"[41] Irenaeus promises to provide an appropriate one. Both the vocabulary and logic of his argument recall 1.4.3. Whereas in 1.4.3 he described the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter as a τραγῳδία, he again uses a dramatic metaphor, describing the *scena*/σκηνή of the Gnostics, also referred to as "their farce" (μῖμος αὐτῶν). As part of Irenaeus's promised finale, he also reprises the theme of Gnostic diversity first also introduced in 1.4.3 as well. Yet whereas in 1.4.3 this theme was linked to the absurdity of people actually paying for Gnostic teaching, in 1.9.5 Irenaeus juxtaposes the notion of Gnostic diversity with the unity of the faith of the church, something which he will elaborate in depth throughout the remainder of *Against Heresies*.

The Rule of Truth proper commences in 1.10.1-2. In an analysis of its opening lines, in light of the discussion of Irenaeus's use of language in the preceding chapters, one cannot help but note that, whatever its origin, Irenaeus's presentation of the Rule follows directly from his creation and appropriation of the Gnostics' theological vocabulary. He begins with "the church," ἡ ἐκκλησία, its first appearance since 1.6.2, continuing the delineation between the true Church and various Gnostic understandings of the word. The church is "dispersed" throughout the world. The verb

---

[41] "*Quoniam autem scenae huic deest redemptio*/ἐπειδὴ (δὲ) τῇ σκηνῇ ταύτῃ λείπει ἡ ἀπόλυσις," SC 264: 150-51. Following both Rousseau and Unger, the conjecture of ἀπόλυσις, in its theatrical understanding of a dismissal, rather than theologically loaded ἀπολύτρωσις (deliverance, redemption) of Epiphanius's text, ties in with both the sense of the passage and the previous allusion to theatrical imagery in 1.4.3. For Rousseau's discussion, see SC 263: 222-23; Unger, footnote 25, 183.

employed is seminata/διεσπαρμένη. This concept has a technical meaning within the Gnostic system of salvation, as employed by Irenaeus in 1.5.6 in reference to seed planted within Demiurge by Achamoth. Yet it also recalls the Preface to the work, in which Irenaeus hoped that his reader would reap the seeds of his work; here the terminology is reappropriated and applied to the church which is spread like seed throughout the world.

Irenaeus also alludes to the Preface in his presentation of the next significant theme, the apostolic transmission of doctrine, which next appears in the Rule of Truth. The church "received from the apostles and their disciples the faith . . ." The last mention of the disciples, apart from his sections listing examples of Gnostic exegesis, has to do with the Valentinian disciples with whom Irenaeus conversed in Preface.2. *Discipulus*/μαθητής appears first in Preface.3 in reference to the Valentinians. It appears three times more, in 1.3.2, 3.3, and 3.5 (where it is included in a quotation from Luke 14.27). In 1.3.2 it refers to the eighteen months which Jesus spent with his disciples as proving the eighteen Aeons outside of the Duodecad. More interestingly, in 1.3.3 it describes Jesus as teaching his disciples the truth of the Aeons through his healing. In this sense, the use in 10.1 could recall both the disciples of Valentinians, contrasting their teachings with those of the Lord's apostles, as well as claiming the true teaching of the disciples, as opposed to the Gnostic claim to apostolic teaching in 3.3.

Turning to the credal formulation of the Rule,[42] Irenaeus presents a Trinitarian formulation, beginning with professing "the faith in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth and the seas and all things that are in them." Throughout his presentation of the Trinity, Irenaeus is following the linguistic methodology of first hinting, then elaborating the meaning of the word in his Gnostic system, then finally reappropriating the same word. The phrase "God the Father Almighty"[43] demonstrates this, having been previewed in 1.3.6. Irenaeus is also accomplishing another important goal in 1.10.1-2: he is furthering his own exegesis, begun in earnest in the chiasm in 1.9.1-4. Thus while returning to

---

[42] While arguing that Irenaeus is drawing on some formulation of the faith already available, Unger draws attention to the fact that many of the statements do appear to be typically Irenaean. What he does not discuss in his notes is how the words which make up these doctrinal statements are employed and crafted by Irenaeus in 1.1.1-1.9.4. See Unger's discussion, footnote 1, 183-84; he once again follows Rousseau, SC 263: 223-24.

[43] "*in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem*/εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα," SC 264: 155; compare 1.3.6, where the same phrase is used: "*in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem*/εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα," SC 264: 62.

some of the important phrases in his Trinitarian exposition, Irenaeus also describes the Trinity with a host of Scriptural allusions.

This method of exegesis, which Unger and Rousseau have noted, is used in conjunction with his construction of theological vocabulary, as the next line shows. The one God is "creator of heaven and earth and the seas and all things that are in them." This description of God's creating power is part of the steady accumulation of Scriptural quotations in 1.10.1, alluding to Exodus 20.11 and Psalm 146.6. Yet in describing God specifically as creator of the heaven and earth and the seas, Irenaeus points back to his critique of the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter in 1.4.4., which contains the only other appearance of the word sea (*mare*/θάλασσα) in Book 1. The difference between fresh water and sea water was part of Irenaeus's argument from logical grounds against the Gnostics; in 1.10.1 Irenaeus restores the one God to the role of creator of everything, and does so through the first of his series of Scripture quotations, which in turn recall his prior critique of Gnostic exegesis from logical grounds.

Regarding the second person of the Trinity, Irenaeus professes faith in "one Jesus Christ, the son of God, who was enfleshed for our salvation." In this sentence Irenaeus continues in the same manner of presentation: "enfleshed," alludes to John 1:14,[44] which was the centerpiece of his exegesis in 1.9.1-4. This phraseology likewise presents an orthodox understanding of salvation. *Salus*/σωτηρία has appeared once before in *Against Heresies*, in 1.6.1, where Irenaeus accuses the Gnostics of teaching that "material substance is incapable of receiving salvation."[45] The hylics are not capable of being saved, in Irenaeus's interpretation of Gnostic teaching, because the world was created in order for the Savior to save the psychics, who need to discipline the body in order to be saved. In Irenaeus's description of the Son of God, there is no discussion of layers of construction: there is one Christ, not multiple Saviors, who actually took flesh, not a "body of ensouled substance." Furthermore, his description of Jesus taking flesh, despite the soteriological significance which Unger rightly gives

---

[44] John 1:14 :"καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο." Unger has chosen "enfleshed" rather than "incarnate" or "made flesh" apparently in an attempt to draw attention to the fact that Irenaeus is countering Gnostic understandings of salvation, though he does so without further explanation and without referring to any quotations from Irenaeus. Summarizing Irenaeus's point, Unger writes, "He assumed flesh, and all flesh is capable of salvation (Unger, footnote 4, 184)."

[45] "*non enim esse hylicon capacem salutis*/μὴ γὰρ εἶναι τὴν ὕλην δεκτικὴν σωτηρίας," SC 264: 92.

it, also recalls Irenaeus's exegesis in 1.9.3, where the same construction appears as part of his exhortation: "Certainly if any other of the Aeons had become flesh[46] for our salvation, in all probability the Apostle would have spoken of that other Aeon." While correct in his interpretation, Unger fails to appreciate the combination of exegesis, appropriation, and exposition which lie behind Irenaeus's description of Jesus.

Irenaeus's description of the role of the Spirit occupies the largest section of his exposition of the Rule of Truth.[47] While the role of the Spirit as the voice of the prophets is typically Irenaean, the Spirit is described as "preaching the economies," "κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας."[48] What follows is a long series of allusions to Scripture describing the events in the life of the earthly Jesus.[49] In Irenaeus's description of the Gnostic understanding of salvation, in 1.6.1 and 1.7.2-3, *dispositio*/οἰκονομία formed a key component of this system. In 1.6.1, as noted above, it is "from the economy" that Savior takes his body of ensouled substance.[50] This same description of the role of Economy Christ's fourfold creation is repeated in 1.7.2. Irenaeus also elaborates the Gnostic understanding of salvation in 1.7.2, describing how they believed that the "ensouled element suffered . . . because of the economy, in order that through him the Mother might display the type of the Christ on high." In Irenaeus's presentation, the Economy, the plan of salvation of the incarnate human person Jesus, is part of revealing the seed of knowledge planted in the offspring of Achamoth. By his description of the Spirit, the dispositio is firmly linked to the events of the human Jesus, as described in the Scriptures.

In 1.10.1, Irenaeus has expounded three elements of the theology central to *Against Heresies* and his response to Gnostic teaching: belief in the one God who is also the creator, salvation of the flesh through Jesus' incarnation, and of the revealing of this plan through the life of Christ as put forth in the Scriptures. The Rule of Truth, permeated throughout by

---

[46] "*caro factus est*/σὰρξ ἐγένετο," SC 264:143.

[47] For the functioning of the Spirit within the Rule of Truth, see Donovan, 11-12.

[48] SC 264: 155.

[49] For a description of the functioning of τὰς οἰκονομίας in Irenaeus, see Rousseau (SC 263: 223-24). Rousseau describes the "economies" of the Spirit as revealing the prefigurements of Christ in the Old Testament, with salvation accomplished through the work of the Son. This appears to be drawing too much of a distinction between the functioning of Father, Son, and Spirit.

[50] "*a dispositione autem circumdatum corpus, animalem habens substantiam*/ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας περιτεθεῖσθαι σῶμα, ψυχικὴν ἔχον οὐσίαν," SC 263: 92.

Biblical language, is the culmination of 1.1.1-1.10.2. The formulation of the Rule is likewise the product of Irenaeus's construction of theological vocabulary in his description of the systems of the Gnostics.

V. *Conclusion*

The thesis presented for this paper—that Irenaeus's Rule of Truth is best understood through the unfolding of his descriptions of Gnosticism—has taken the form of a commentary on *Against Heresies* 1.1-1.10, for the reason that Irenaeus's method and style of writing and argumentation demand such an approach. Attention to structure as well as vocabulary is essential in order to grasp what Irenaeus is doing. While Books 2-5 have undergone intense scrutiny (Books 3-5 in particular), Book 1, so far, has not. This paper has shown that, just as Irenaeus is no longer considered an inept editor of other people's works, so should Book 1 be liberated from form-critical study and debates about Irenaeus's historical reliability. It also provides a partial answer to the questions raised by Mary Ann Donovan some fifteen years ago concerning the role of the Rule within Book 1.[51] The Rule of Truth, though significant for the development of doctrine, is at its essence a product of the creation of theological discourse in *Against Heresies*, and part of the developing critique of Gnosticism which occupy Books 2-5.

The Episcopal Church Center
815 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10017-4594
USA

[51] See Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," 223. Applying this thesis to the second formulation of the Rule of Truth, my contention is that 1.22 functions much in the same way as 1.10. To prove this would require a commentary on 1.13-21 as extensive as that on 1.1-1.10. To give but a few examples: the references to baptism and "redemptio", both leading into the Rule of Truth in 1.9.5, are repeated in 1.21.1. Whereas refuting Gnostic notions of salvation governs Irenaeus's description of Jesus and the Spirit, the question in 1.21 is redemption, countered in 1.22. Further work also needs to be done to show how the language/themes of Book 1 are taken up throughout the Books 3-5.

DAS VALENTINREFERAT DES IRENÄUS VON LYON (*HAER* I 11,1)

VON

PAUL SCHÜNGEL

Von den Kirchenvätern ist der Märtyrer Justin (Hinrichtung wohl 167) der einzige Zeitgenosse des römischen Gnostikers Valentin[1] (vermutlich ca. 100-160). Justin und Valentin waren in Rom tätig, sogar als Kollegen oder richtiger gesagt Konkurrenten: beide treten öffentlich[2] als "Philosophen" auf, sie lehren nämlich gegen Honorar "das rechte Leben". Beide nutzen sie die Lehrweise der damaligen Philosophie, vor allem platonischer Tradition. Allerdings tat Valentin dies auf sprachlich und intellektuell viel höherem Niveau als sein später gekommener Konkurrent. Justin erwähnt in seinen Schriften, soweit sie erhalten sind, Valentin nicht, wohl aber einmal "Valentinianer". Er diffamiert sie pauschal[3] zusammen mit anderen gnostischen Gruppen und zeigt auf diese Weise, wie wenig Verständnis er für die Anliegen und Lehren der Gnostiker hat.

---

[1] Christoph Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins, Tübingen 1992 (WUNT 65).

[2] Im Verhör antwortet Justin auf die Frage, wo er lehre: "Ich habe feste Bleibe (in den Räumen) eines gewissen Martinus über den Thermen des Timiotinos, und zwar schon all die Zeit, die ich hier bin. Es ist übrigens das zweite Mal, dass ich mich in der Stadt der Römer (als Lehrer) niedergelassen habe, und ich habe nie einen anderen Ort zur Versammlung erwogen als eben diesen. Und wer immer auch kommen wollte, um bei mir (zu lernen), ich habe mit ihm (nur) die Lehren der Wahrheit (τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας λογῶν) erörtert." (*M. Justin.* 3,3, bei Wartelle 228,6-13; Übersetzung Schüngel).

[3] *Dial.* 35,5f: "Sie lehren nämlich—die einen auf diese, die anderen auf jene Weise—Lästerungen gegen den Schöpfer des Weltalls und gegen Christus, dessen Ankunft von ihm geweissagt wurde, und gegen den Gott Abrahams, Isaaks und Jakobs. Mit keinem von ihnen haben wir Gemeinschaft; denn wir wissen, daß sie in ihrer Gottvergessenheit, Gottlosigkeit, Sündhaftigkeit und Lasterhaftigkeit auch Jesus nur dem Namen nach bekennen, nicht aber ihn verehren ..... Von jenen heißen die einen Marcianer, andere Valentinianer, andere Basilidianer, andere Satornilianer, die einen so, die andern anders; jeder hat seinen Namen vom Gründer des Systems." (Übersetzung Ph. Haeuser, BKV 33,52).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 376-405

Wie ein christlicher "Philosoph" praktisch arbeitete, beschreibt sehr deutlich ein anderer Zeitgenosse der beiden, Hermas, der Autor des "Hirten". Hermas lebt ebenfalls in Rom und kennt diese christlichen Lehrer offenbar aus eigener Anschauung:

> Er[4] zeigte mir einige Leute, die auf einer (Schüler-)Bank saßen, und einen Mann, der auf seinem (Lehr-)Stuhl (καθέδρα) saß. Und er fragte mich: Siehst du die auf der Bank?—Ja, Herr, sagte ich.—Das sind, sagte er, Glaubende, doch der auf dem Stuhl ist ein Lügenprophet, der die Einsicht (διάνοια) der Diener Gottes verdirbt, aber nur bei den Zweiflern, nicht bei den (wahrhaft) Glaubenden. Diese Zweifler nun kommen (zu ihm) wie zu einem Wahrsager (ὡς ἐπὶ μάντιν) und fragen ihn aus, was denn nun mit ihnen sein soll.[5] Und jener falsche Prophet, der keinerlei Kraft vom Geist Gottes her in sich hat,[6] redet mit ihnen so, wie sie gefragt haben und wie es ihre üblen Begierden verlangen: so füllt er sie an mit dem, was sie (gerne haben) wollen. Denn er selbst ist leer und kann leeren Menschen nur Leeres antworten: wenn er gefragt wird, so gibt er Antwort ganz entsprechend der Leere des Fragers. Einige seiner Lehren jedoch trägt er ganz der (christlichen) Wahrheit gemäß vor.
>
> Mand XI (43,1-3) Übersetzung Schüngel

---

[4] "Er" ist der "Hirte", der angelus interpres. Die Dialogform ist literarisch nur dürftig ausgeführt, dennoch ist sie *konstitutiv* für den Text, denn dieser läuft auf das mandatum im letzten Satz hinaus: "Schenke also diesem Geist (der in der Gemeinde ungefragt und unverfügbar auftritt) Glauben, von dem anderen aber (der im bezahlten Privatunterricht auf persönliche Fragen antwortet) halte dich fern!" Der Dialog ist auf den Leser hin angelegt: Hermas vertritt in ihm die Rolle eines eher einfältigen Christen, der "Hirt" ist das alter ego des Autors, denn er spricht nicht ex autoritate angeli, sondern *wie ein Advokat* "beweist" er dem Leser anhand von Indizien, wo der rechte Geist spricht.

[5] Die Fragestellung τί ἄρα ἔσται αὐτοῖς ist doppeldeutig: In einer Schulstunde unter dem Thema εὖ ζῆν fragt sie nach dem anzustrebenden Dasein(sweg), der Leser aber soll sie nicht in diesem Kontext verstehen, sondern als Orakelanfrage. R. Joly übersetzt "Ceux qui doutent viennent à lui comme à un devin et le questionnent sur leur avenir." und kommentiert "Ainsi, les pseudoprophètes font oeuvre de divination." (SC 53, 193 mit Anm. 2).

[6] Irenäus nimmt diese Formulierung auf: "The one passage in Irenaeus in which the phrase τὸ κενὸν πνεῦμα occurs is A. H. I 13,2 (richtig: 13,4!). This is part of the account of the prophetic activities of the Gnostic teacher Marcus; between this account and the 11th Mandate there exist many similarities, to such an extend that we may safely assume that Irenaeus used materials of the 11th Mandate for his picture of Marcus." J. Reiling, *Hermas and the christian prophecy. A study of the 11th mandate* Leiden 1973 (NTSuppl 37) 41. Das bedeutet aber: Irenäus arbeitet hier nicht nach Quellen oder eigenen Beobachtungen, sondern sammelt die in seinen Kreisen umlaufenden Klischees, um sie den Gegnern anzuheften!

Hermas polemisiert heftig, aber ganz realistisch malt er die Szenerie: Es handelt sich um einen schulischen *Privatunterricht*, ganz so, wie auch Justin seinen Unterricht hielt (s. Anm. 2). Dann aber ist es sachwidrig, einen solchen Lehrer als "Lügen-*Propheten*" zu bezeichnen. Denn "Prophet" ist eine christliche Fachbezeichnung und meint den bezahlten Lehrer, der *in der Gemeindeversammlung* die LXX auslegt und an die Weisungen Jesu[7] erinnert. Ein christlicher "Philosoph" hat keinen derartigen Auftrag der Gemeinde und will ihn auch nicht haben (siehe Mand XI,14!). Er wendet sich vielmehr an Christen, denen die Belehrung in der Gemeinde nicht genügt, an "Zweifler",[8] die mit ihren Glaubensproblemen, öfter wohl mit ihren Lebensproblemen kompetentere Hilfe suchen und bereit sind, für solche Hilfe auch zu zahlen. Das alles weiß Hermas, auch weiß er, dass ein solcher privater Unterricht intellektuell anspruchsvoll ist und nichts mit Zukunfts-Wahrsagerei zu tun hat. Dennoch spielt er polemisch diese Karte. Offenbar hat er kaum Sach-Argumente gegen solche Lehrer, deshalb bleibt ihm nur, sie als obskurante Wahrsager[9] zu verleumden.

---

[7] Die Spezialstudie von Reiling (Anm. 6) kommt zum Ergebnis:" . . . it is clear that the church as a gathered community is indispensable if prophecy is to function properly" (176); diese Propheten "are not 'Pneumatiker' in a sense that they possess the spirit to a higher degree than the ordinary members of the church." (175).—Als ein spezieller Dienst in der Gemeinde verkündet und aktualisiert der Prophet die (atl.) Gottesoffenbarung (ein Beispiel dafür ist Barn 6,5-7,2, s. dazu Ferdinand R. Postmeier *Der Barnabasbrief*, Göttingen 1999 (KAV 8) 255-283). Dieser Prophetendienst in der Gemeinde hat nichts mit Zukunftsdeutung und Wahrsagerei zu tun. Allerdings hat das Verb προφητεύω im profanen Gebrauch durchaus die Bedeutung "wahrsagen, Zukünftiges enthüllen"; diese populäre Bedeutung nutzt Hermas für seine Polemik.

[8] Hermas behandelt den "Zweifel" thematisch in Mand IX, zunächst den Zweifel an der Gebetserhörung, dann aber einen grundsätzlicheren Zweifel: "Wende dich ganz ab vom Zweifelsinn und sei völlig Herr über ihn in allen Angelegenheiten, (denn du bist) gerüstet mit dem starken und mächtigen Christenglauben. Denn der Christenglaube verspricht alles, er erfüllt auch alles; der Zweifelsinn aber bezweifelt sogar sich selbst (ἡ διψυχία καταπιστεύουσα) und scheitert darum bei jeder Sache, die er unternimmt." (*PH* 39,10; Übersetzung Schüngel). In Mand XI sagt Hermas δίψυχοι . . . πυκνῶς μετανοοῦσιν (*PH* 43,4): "diese sind Zweifler und ändern ständig ihre Ansichten". Im damaligen kulturellen Kontext können damit nur Leute mit religiös-philosophischem Problembewusstsein gemeint sein. Bei der Homerlektüre im elementaren Schulunterricht war Skepsis gegenüber den Götterlehren ein wichtiges Unterrichtsziel und wurde von den Philosophen im höheren Unterricht vorausgesetzt—so theologisch die meisten Philosophen dann auch argumentierten. Die δίψυχοι sind also die gebildeten Intellektuellen und ihre Lehrer, die Philosophen.—Ausführlich zum "Zweifel" s. den Exkurs bei N. Brox *Der Hirt des Hermas* 1991 (KAV 7) 551-553 und den Exkurs zum "Oppositions-Begriff" Einfacheit (ἁπλότης) 500-502.

[9] "They go to him ὡς ἐπὶ μάντιν i.e. as the heathen go to a soothsayer. A little further,

Wer aber ist hier gemeint? In Rom gab es gewiss nicht viele *christliche* Philosophen zur Zeit des Hermas, der bekannteste und erfolgreichste von ihnen war Valentin. Hermas wirft dem Ungenannten vor, dass er arrogant auftrete: er beanspruche eine intellektuelle Führungsposition (πρωτοκαθηδρία), sei im Reden unbescheiden und wortreich (ἀναιδὴς καὶ πολύλαλος), auch lebe er auf großem Fuß (Mand XI,12). Er suche sich seine Kunden zusammen und gebe nur Privatunterricht (κατὰ γωνίαν αὐτοῖς προφητεύει = er gibt seine Wahrsagerei nur im Winkel (Mand XI,13)). Jeder zeitgenössische Leser des "Hirten", der die Verhältnisse in Rom kannte, musste bei dieser Schilderung vielleicht nicht ausschließlich, aber vor allem an Valentin[10] denken.

Etwa vierzig Jahre später, in den achtziger Jahren des 2. Jahrhunderts schreibt Irenäus von Lyon sein umfangreiches Werk "Entlarvung und Widerlegung der fälschlich sogenannten Gnosis". Darin behandelt er Valentin *ausdrücklich* nur einmal, nämlich im Buch I Kap. 11,1. Valentin ist längst Begründer einer eigenen Tradition, einer Schule[11] geworden. Irenäus verbirgt nicht seine polemische Einstellung gegenüber dieser Schule, er sagt

---

however, the author modifies his statement and writes that the double-minded μαντεύονται ὡς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη. Like μάντις this verb has a strong pagan connotation, and hence consulting the false prophet is tantamount to the sin of idiolatry." Reiling (Anm. 6) 34.

[10] Reiling (Anm. 6) 65 diskutiert die schon 1865 von Lipsius vorgetragenen These, "that the picture of the false prophet in Hermas fits the Gnostics perfectly." Er wendet ein, dass hier nicht Lehre, sondern Wahrsagerei gesucht und geboten werde, konzediert aber: "It is, however, conceivable that Hermas contains polemics against Gnosticism to such an extant that it is at least probable to see the false prophet as a representative of this movement." (65) Reiling behandelt dann ausdrücklich Valentin, kommt aber zum Ergebnis "that there is very little in Hermas which refers to controversies with Gnostic teachers" (66). Das ist richtig, hat aber einen einfachen Grund: Hermas kann und will nicht *argumentativ* auf die Lehren Valentins eingehen, denn er hat wohl keinen Zugang zu dessen Denken, obwohl beide ernsthafte und engagierte Christen sind, in der gleichen Stadt leben und in der gleichen Sprache (freilich mit sehr unterschiedlicher Kompetenz!) schreiben.

[11] Irenäus *Haer* I 30,15: *Tales quidem secundum eos sententiae sunt, a quibus velut Lernea hydra multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini scola generata est.*—Chr. Markschies hat den Relativsatz sehr problematisiert (Nochmals: Valentinus und die Gnostikoi *VigChr* 51 (1997) 179-187), er findet unverständlich, dass etwas zugleich *a quibus* und *de scola* entstand. Ich meine, Irenäus greift hier zur Kunstfigur der ἔλλειψις/*detractio*, die so aufzulösen ist: "Wie (aus dem Sumpf) die Lernäische Schlange entstand, ebenso entstand mit diesen (vielen Männern), die derartige Lehrsätze vorbringen, aus der Schule Valentins ein Ungeheuer, das (nun) viele Köpfe hat." Die Polemik zielt auf den jetzigen Zustand der Schule Valentins: die Vielzahl ihrer *capita* = Lehrautoritäten mache sie unglaubwürdig.

mit Nachdruck, worum es ihm geht: Er will aufzeigen, dass die Schüler Valentins sich ständig widersprechen. Etwas überraschend referiert er dann aber nicht Lehren der Schüler, sondern Lehrsätze Valentins, also—nach seiner Behauptung—Originaltexte[12] des Meisters. Einleitend gibt Irenäus an, welche Stellung und Bedeutung er Valentin persönlich zuschreibt:

> Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως
> τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας,
> Οὐαλιντῖνος οὕτως ὡρίσατο·

Irenäus bezeichnet die gnostische Tradition als eine αἵρεσις,[13] das ist eine vom Christentum, wie er es vertritt, willkürlich abgespaltene Lehrauffassung. Mit ἀπό ist die *Herkunft* der Abspaltung benannt; Valentin ist πρῶτος, weil mit ihm diese Abspaltung angefangen[14] habe. Valentin habe die eine Kirche gespalten, indem er ihre[15] Grundlagen, d.h. ihre fundamentalen Lehrsätze *korrigierte* (μεθαρμόζω), er habe nämlich diesen Grundlagen für die Zwecke seines Lehrbetriebs (διδασκαλεῖον) ein neues Gepräge[16] gegeben.

---

[12] Markschies (Anm. 1) 263 bezweifelt, dass Irenäus solche Quellen hatte: "Bereits ungefähr zwanzig Jahre nach dem mutmaßlichen Ende von Valentins römischer Wirksamkeit lassen sich von der Lehrtätigkeit eines gefeierten altchristlichen Theologen nur noch kleine Bruchstücke auftreiben." Das ist unwahrscheinlich, sogar widerlegbar.—Nur G. Quispel hat, soweit ich sehe, darauf bestanden, dass *Haer* I 11,1 valentinisches Gut enthalte, so gutes sogar "that this short summary still furnishes a valid basis for the reconstruction of the original doctrine of Valentinus". (Valentinian Gnosis and the Apocryphon of John, in: *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* I Leiden 1980 (SHR 41/1) 123).

[13] Das ist damals ein Fachwort der Philosophen: die etablierten Philosophenschulen bezeichneten damit von ihrer Generallinie abweichende Lehren. Irenäus übernimmt mit diesem Sprachgebrauch diese Abwehrhaltung.

[14] Den gleichen Vorwurf der Traditionslosigkeit macht Irenäus *Haer* III 4,3: "Vor Valentin gab es keine Valentinianer . . ., noch irgend solche Leute bösartiger Gesinnung, wie wir sie vorhin erwähnten, bevor nicht die Anreger und Erfinder (*initiatores et inventores*) ihrer Perversion auftraten. Valentin kam nach Rom unter Hyginus, erreichte seinen Höhepunkt unter Pius und hielt sich bis Anicet." Hier datiert Irenäus den Beginn der αἵρεσις in die 30er Jahre des 2. Jahrhunderts! Andererseits kennt er wie schon Justin (*Apol* I 26) eine *successio*, die mit Simon Magus beginnt. Dann lautet das Ergebnis: "*A talibus patribus et proavis eos qui a Valentino sint, sicut ipsae sententiae et regulae ostendunt*" (*Haer* I 31,3).

[15] Nicht gnostische ἀρχαί (Glaubensgrundsätze), das wäre ja keine αἵρεσις gewesen! Andererseits formuliert Irenäus bewusst zweideutig.

[16] Irenäus nutzt das Bild vom Münzen-Prägen: In der Antike schlug man Münzen nicht nur aus vorbereiteten Metallstücken, sondern bisweilen auch aus Münzen (Überprägungen). Irenäus meint: Valentin habe der echten Münze "Christentum" seine eigene Prägung (ἴδιον χαρακτήρ) gegeben, also gewaltsam und mit krimineller Energie das wahre Christentum verfälscht.—Das gleiche Bild auch *Haer* I 24,7 28,1 und II 31,1.

Erst zuletzt nennt er Valentin namentlich und erklärt, dieser habe seine Korrektur erreicht, indem er neue ἀρχαί *definiert habe*; entsprechend beginnt der erste Satz des Referats mit dem εἶναι einer Definition! Ich löse den absichtsvoll verschachtelten Satz auf und übersetze:

> Der erste aus der Abspaltung (vom Christenglauben), die man gnostisch nennt, ist Valentin. Denn er hat die (christlichen) Grundlagen korrigiert, indem er sie für seine Lehrtätigkeit[17] (gewaltsam) umprägte. Dazu hat er (diese Grundlagen) in folgender Weise neu festgesetzt:

Irenäus kündigt damit ein Referat über die "neu definierten Lehrgrundsätze" Valentins an, tatsächlich folgen Definitionssätze. Aber diese Sätze machen auf den Leser den Eindruck wirrer, unverständlicher Fantasie. Das ist Absicht. Irenäus gibt sich keine Mühe, Valentins Lehre zu verstehen oder gar zu erläutern. Der Kirchenvater will nicht informieren, sondern *desinformieren*; er will nicht Grundpositionen des wichtigsten Gegners skizzieren, sondern ihn als eigensinnigen, fantasierenden Wirrkopf *lächerlich machen*. Genaugenommen ist das Valentinreferat *Haer* I 11,1 nicht Polemik, sondern es ist *Agitation*.[18]

Weil die Dinge so stehen, halte ich das folgende Vorgehen für geboten: Man muss die redaktionelle Arbeit des Irenäus abtrennen von den Texten und Motiven, die er von Valentin übernommen hat.[19] Da erweislich ist, dass die Texte/Motive bei Valentin in verschiedenem Zusammenhang standen, muss jedes Textstückchen bzw. Motiv für sich genommen werden: dort einen Zusammenhang, gar ein "System" zu finden, das ist eine der falschen Fährten, auf die Irenäus locken will. Weiter muss man versuchen, in Kenntnis der Argumentationsweise Valentins und im Wissen um seine theologischen Anliegen *Sachkritik* an den einzelnen Texten bzw. Motiven zu üben, das heißt zu prüfen, ob sie zur Argumentation und Lehre der

---

[17] Irenäus unterstellt: Valentin ging unter die Philosophen, also auf den öffentlichen Markt; um da erfolgreich zu sein (und das war er!), musste er Neues, Sensationelles bieten.

[18] Das wird besonders deutlich, wenn man auf die Fortsetzung achtet: Irenäus berichtet *Haer* I 11,2 kurz von einem gewissen Sekundus und seinen Korrekturen am angeblichen "System" Valentins, dann ausführlich von der Lehre eines Ungenannten, den Irenäus gewiss erfunden hat, denn dessen Lehre besteht in Benennungswillkür. Diese nutzt der Kirchenvater dann in 11,4 für eine drastische "Verkürbissung" (ein damals arg abgenutzter Gag der Parodie), in 11,5 rührt er einem wirren Begriffs-Salat an. Das alles ist populärer Klamauk.

[19] Natürlich ist dieser Grundsatz allgemein anerkannt. Was Markschies (Anm. 1) 367 Anm. 232-234 aufzählt bzw. in der Übersetzung 409-411 bietet, ist nur die "Irenäische Rahmung"; man muss aber gerade die versteckten Bearbeitungen der Quellentexte herauszufinden.

Fragmente passen oder nicht. Leider kann man nicht die erste methodische Forderung erfüllen und dann erst zur zweiten vorrücken: man muss sie schon ständig kombinieren.

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 1. Satz des Referats

a Εἶναι Δυάδα ἀνονόμαστον,
Es sei eine unnennbare Zweiheit,
b ἧς τὸ μέν τι καλεῖσθαι Ἄρρητον, τὸ δὲ Σιγήν·
von der das eine "Unsagbarer" genannt wird, das andere "Schweigen";
c ἔπειτα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς Δυάδος δευτέραν Δυάδα προβεβλῆσθαι,
aus dieser Zweiheit sei dann eine zweite hervorgesprossen,
d ἧς τὸ μέν τι Πατέρα ὀνομάζει, τὸ δὲ Ἀλήθειαν·
von der er (= Valentin) das eine "Vater" nennt, das andere "Wahrheit".
e ἐκ δὲ τῆς Τετράδος ταύτης καρποφορεῖσθαι
Aus eben dieser Vierheit sind Früchte hervorgebracht worden,
Λόγον καὶ Ζωήν, Ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν.
nämlich "Logos" und "Leben", "Mensch" und "Kirche".
f Εἶναί τε ταύτην Ὀγδοάδα πρώτην.
Es sei dies die erste "Achtheit".

Die Satzperiode wird in oratio obliqua vorgetragen: Irenäus referiert die Entwicklung der ersten "Ogdoas". Kennzeichnend für die Gattung ist das vorangestellte und im Schlusssatz f wiederholte εἶναι: Irenäus behauptet, er referiere philosophische Definitionen. Nach den Fragmenten ist aber sicher, dass Valentin nicht deduktiv nach Definitionen dozierte, sondern mit anschaulicher Bildlichkeit *paränetisch* unterrichtete. Wenn Irenäus, wie er behauptet, hier Grundsätze Valentins referiert, so hat er *ihre literarische Gattung verschoben*!

Das primäre konstitutive Element dieser Periode ist wohl nicht das Zahlenschema, sondern der Vorgang, den die Verben προβάλλω ("hervorsprossen, einen Zweig treiben", lat.: *emittere*)[20] und καρποφορέω ("Früchte bringen/tragen", lat.: *fructificari*) bezeichnen. Das Zahlenschema hat, vermute ich, erst Irenäus in den Vordergrund gespielt, um auf diese Weise die Bedeutung des Textes zu verschieben und den Leser auf eine Spur zu setzen, die in die Irre führt. Denn Irenäus redet im nächsten Satz von zehn bzw. zwölf Kräften, aber man versteht nicht, was das soll. Wenn

[20] Üblich ist die Übersetzung "emanieren". Dies ist ein Fachwort der Philosophie, das Plotin in einem sehr speziellen Sinne gebraucht hat. Weder Valentin noch Irenäus können Plotin, der ca. 205-270 lebte, gelesen haben. Wichtiger ist: Valentin nimmt nicht wie z.B. SapSal 7,25 das (archetypische) Bild von der rinnenden Quelle auf, sondern er wählt als ein Sprachkenner bewusst προβάλλω und καρποφορέω, denn er will die *vegetativen* Bilder, die diese Worte malen. Wer *Valentin* verstehen will, muss seine Bildwahl respektieren.

man diese Angabe zu interpretieren versucht, wozu die Zahlen (und die Paralleltexte *Haer* I 1,1 und 17,1.2) geradezu verlocken, sitzt man schon in der Falle der Desinformationen, die Irenäus aufgestellt hat: man möchte den Aufbau der hier skizzierten Jenseitswelt verstehen und das "System" Valentins begreifen. Nimmt man jedoch die beiden Verben in 1c und e als das primäre konstitutive Element des Valentintextes, so steht fest, dass hier das eindrucksvolle *Bild* fruchttragender Zweige oder ährentragender Halme vorgestellt wird, genauer gesagt ein Doppelbild: Zweige wachsen heraus und ihre Früchte werden präsentiert. Solch anschauliches Formulieren passt weit besser zu Valentin als schulgemäße Definitionssätze. Weiter fällt auf, dass die beiden Verben durchaus gegen die Natur der Sache passivisch gebraucht werden. Ich verstehe dieses Passiv als *pass. divinum*. Das entspricht Valentins Redeweise, denn dieser war sehr bemüht, von Gott und seinem Handeln nicht direkt zu sprechen. Als Träger des göttlichen Hervorbringens bezeichnet Irenäus eine "unnennbare Zweiheit", die allerdings im erläuternden Relativsatz doch benannt wird: zeigt das nicht, dass hier recht sorglos geklittert worden ist? Jedenfalls kann Valentin nicht von einer göttlichen "Dyas"[21] gesprochen haben. Im Gegensatz zu dieser "Dyas" in 1a ist im Satz 3 von einer einzigen "Tiefe"[22] die Rede. Gesetzt, diese "Tiefe", verstanden als Gottesbenennung, sei ursprünglich der Handelnde gewesen, dann kann man das Passiv durch die Umschreibung mit "lassen" gut ausdrücken: Die "Tiefe" lässt "Unsagbar" und "Schweigen" hervorsprossen. Das wäre wohl eine sinnvolle Aussage, aber kein Bild. Bleibt man beim pass. divinum des Textes und bemüht man sich um lakonische Kürze, dann muss man formulieren:

> Als Zweige werden getrieben "Unsagbar und "Schweigen", "Vater" und "Wahrheit", als Früchte werden hervorgebracht "Logos" und "Leben", "Einzelmensch" und "Gemeinde der Berufenen",

griechisch—*als visio* und im Chiasmus formuliert—hieß es wohl:

> *ὸρᾶται/βλέπω*[23]
> Ἄρρητος καὶ Σιγὴ Πατὴρ καὶ Ἀλήθεια προβεβλῆσαι
> καρποφορεῖσθαι Λόγος καὶ Ζωὴ Ἄνθρωπος καὶ Ἐκκλησία.

---

[21] "Schwierigkeiten bereitet auch die dualistische Konzeption des Abschnitts 1, die *Haer* I 11,1 zwar mit dem valentinianischen System 'A' verbindet, aber kaum mit der monistischen Tendenz der Fragmente und Tertullians verglichen werden kann." (Markschies (Anm. 1) 377 mit Fußnote 292).

[22] Darauf verweist auch Markschies (Anm. 1) 371 Anm. 256.

[23] Ich bin nicht der Ansicht, dass das verbum videndi ausgedrückt war; es ergab sich selbstverständlich aus dem NcI.

Diese hypothetische, aber den Wortlaut unangetastet lassende Rekonstruktion ergibt eine völlig neue Textgattung: *eine Meditationsanleitung*. Eine solche Anleitung hat ihren Sitz im Leben im seelsorglich ausgerichteten Unterricht. Valentin hat nicht Definitionen vorgetragen, um daraus wie Euklid in seinen "Elementen" Schritt für Schritt zwingende Schlüsse zu ziehen, sondern er hat, wie die Fragmente ausweisen, psychologisch geschickt unterrichtet, um seine Hörer mit dichterischer Kraft zur Meditation und Selbsteinsicht zu führen. Dabei ging es nicht um intellektuelles Bescheid-Wissen, sondern um ermutigende Antworten auf existentielle Fragen und Lebensnöte. Valentin musste seinen Klienten etwas mit nach Hause geben, wovon sie zehren konnten. Hier tat er dies mit einem dichterischen Zweizeiler, der leicht zu behalten[24] ist. Der eine ganz jenseitige Gott bleibt unsichtbar, ungenannt und schlechthin verborgen; der meditierende Gnostiker aber erkennt vier "Namen", die bei der Meditation "herausgetrieben sind" (προβεβλῆσθαι in 1c: resultatives gr. Perfekt). Die "Namen" sind nicht die Sache selbst, sondern sind die (durchaus subjektiven, nämlich an die Meditation gebundenen) An-Sichten, die auf den einen schlechthin Un-Sagbaren[25] verweisen. Die vier Namen bilden zwei Paare: "Unsagbar"

---

[24] Antiker Unterricht war papierlos! Die Schüler hatten nur Wachstäfelchen, sie mussten auswendig lernen. Gute Lehrer brachten den Merkstoff in poetische Form, besonders beliebt waren Hexameter. Vier Hexameterzeilen, die man in Rom fand (wissensch. Katalogisierung: ICUR VI,297a), stammen wahrscheinlich aus Valentins Unterricht, s. dazu zuletzt Paul Schüngel, Ein gnostisches Credo—in Stein gehauen! *RQ* 93 (1998) 145-155.

[25] Auf den ersten Blick ganz anders interpretiert Roelof van den Broek: "The principle of androgynos duality is first expressed in Immortal Man and his Sophia. It is to such a concept that Plato's view of the Good as producing Nous and Aletheia could be applied. Valentinus has transformed the principle of duality and fecundity into the deepest ground of being itself, by changing its monadic essence into Bythos and Sige." (Jewish and Platonic Speculations in Early Alexandrian Theology: Eugnostos, Philo, Valentinus, Origen, in: R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* NHMS 39 (1996) 117-130, 128.) Diese Interpretation ist zwar viel differenzierter und verständnisvoller als die Behauptung der Kirchenväter vom doppelten Gott, aber auch sie läuft auf eine dualistische Aufspaltung des Gottesbegriffes hinaus. Das aber verkennt die Intention Valentins. Denn dieser will in der Ogdoas-Formel das Offenbarungswirken des biblischen Gottes darstellen, jedoch nicht als angeblich objektiv in der Bibel gefundene *Heilsgeschichte*, sondern als im Verständnis der Verständigen sich entfaltende *visio* der Zuwendung dieses einen und einzigen Gottes. Doch vertritt, dem Anschein des zitierten Satzes entgegen, van den Broek gar keine Interpretation, die zu meiner konträr ist: Er verweist als Initialzündung einer langen Denktradition auf Platos Spekulation, dass aus (der Idee von) einem Guten als erstes das Ideenpaar Nous und Aletheia entspringen. Das Grundproblem der Gnostiker bezüglich der Gotteslehre benennt van den

und "Schweigen" bilden ein Paar, das sich ergänzt, denn nur "Schweigen" ist die richtige Antwort auf "Unsagbar"—ein höchst beherzigenswerter theologischer Grundsatz![26] Ebenso entspricht "Vater" in dem Sinne, in dem Jesus diese Gottesanrede brauchte, der "Wahrheit" im alttestamentlich-weisheitlichen Sinne: "emet" ist, was das Leben fest macht bei jedem, der gelernt und verinnerlicht hat, wer der schlechthin gute Vater der Verkündigung Jesu ist. Die jeweiligen "Partner" antworten einander, die beiden "Paare" jedoch stehen in dialektischer Spannung, denn "Vater" hebt ja in einem gewissen Sinne "Unsagbar" auf. Und ganz genau so ist es bei den "Früchten", also *den in der Empirie*[27] *sich zeigenden Wirkungen* (καρποφορεῖσθαι in 1e: gr. duratives Präsens): auch da sind je zwei Partner, die sich mögen, ja aufeinander angewiesen sind, die beiden Paare aber stehen in dialektischer Spannung.[28] Die Schönheit des Sprachbildes kann man im Deutschen

---

Broek so: "Eugnostos's real problem is how the monadic and unchangeable being of the ineffable God *can be conceived* as becoming an active and multiplying being" (118, Hervorhebung Schüngel). Von Philo referiert er 120: "According to Philo, the name of God represents the creative and beneficent power of God, and the name of Lord his royal and punishing power"—was andere Juden dann herumdrehten. Das Titelthema ist "Speculations", der Ausgangspunkt dabei ist immer: die "monadic essence" selbst ist nicht sagbar! Plato und Philo und die großen gnostischen Theologen beachten sorgfältig, was kirchliche Theologen meist vergessen: Von Gott selbst kann man nicht reden, sondern nur von den Gottesvorstellungen und -erfahrungen der Menschen. Wenn man dieses Wagnis unternimmt, sollte man wissen, was man tut; der Leser aber sollte an der Dialektik und der immer mitschwingenden ehrfürchtigen Ironie merken, dass solche Rede unter einem ihr eigentümlichen *Vorbehalt* steht.

[26] Die *Exzerpte aus Theodot* 29 formulieren in der gleichen Bildlichkeit und Wortwahl: "Sige, sagen sie, die die Mutter aller ist, die von der "Tiefe" hervorgebracht sind, schwieg von dem, was sie von dem Unsagbaren nicht aussprechen konnte; was sie aber begriff, das hat sie als Unbegreifliches ausgesprochen." (Übersetzung W. Foerster, *Die Gnosis* Bd. 1,292 (BAWC.AC ²1979)) Vergl. die Einsicht Platos: "Also den Urheber und Vater dieses Weltalls aufzufinden, ist schwer, nachdem man ihn aber auffand, ihn allen zu verkünden, unmöglich." (Tim 28c, Übersetzung Schleiermacher/Müller; ebenso 7. Brief 341c).

[27] Valentin musste seinen Hörern echte Hilfe in ihren persönlichen Nöten bieten und darum auf ihre Erfahrungen zu sprechen kommen. Die Gnostiker haben nicht um der Spekulation willen spekuliert, sondern um problembewussten Hörern überzeugende Antworten geben zu können. Man sollte Irenäus nicht glauben, wenn er *Haer* I 4,3 behauptet, die Leute zahlten "hohe Honorare" für "eine ganz abgestandene Theatergeschichte und pure Fantasieerzählung": es ist Irenäus, der die sehr ernsthaften seelsorglichen Bemühungen der Gnostiker als τραγῳδία πολλὴ λοιπόν und φαντασία darstellt!

[28] Diesen Text von zwei Zeilen meditativ auszuschöpfen würde mehrere Seiten, ja einen eigenen Aufsatz erfordern. "Logos" (Urbedeutung: was eine Rechnung aufgehen

nicht voll wiedergeben, denn sie beruht auch darauf, dass die jeweiligen Partner dem grammatischen Geschlecht nach männlich und weiblich sind, also ein "Ehepaar", eine "Syzygie"[29] bilden. Das kann man in der Übersetzung nicht nachahmen. Doch kommt es darauf nicht an, sondern darauf, alle Pole des Sprachbildes meditativ gleichmäßig in der Schwebe zu halten. Den Reichtum dieses Zweizeilers finde ich bewundernswert,[30] eine solche Verdichtung schafft nur ein Genie.[31]

In späteren Auseinandersetzungen wurde die "Ogdoas" zum Bekenntnisartikel. Ein Beispiel dafür ist die Lehrschrift *Testimonium Veritatis* (NHC

---

lässt und einen Satz verstehbar macht) ist hier vermutlich die das Leben *stimmig* machende Einsicht, und entsprechend ist "Leben" eine Existenz aus der Selbsterfahrung einer "Meerestiefe an Vollmacht" (s. unten Anm. 63). Einer, der von diesem Paar bestimmt ist, ist ein ἄνθρωπος, der sich dieser Vollmacht und damit seines Auftrags bewusst geworden ist. Nach gnostischer Auffassung ist er *gerade dadurch* ein mit seiner Singularität und essentiellen Einsamkeit einverstandener Mensch, ein μοναχός, wie das EvThom sagt. Zugleich mit solchen Menschen entsteht ἐκκλησία, das ist "die berufene Gemeinschaft", die solche Menschen einerseits brauchen *und* andererseits ermöglichen: die Gemeinde wird konstituiert durch gemeinsames Werten und Handeln, durch wechselseitiges Ermutigen, Bedenken und Erinnern derjenigen, die mit jesuanischer Liebeskraft bevollmächtig sind.

[29] Es war vermutlich Valentin selbst, der das (uralte, archetypische) Denken in "Syzygien" für die Gnosis fruchtbar machte. Weil Valentin ein an Plato geschulter dialektischer Denker ist, nutzt er die Geschlechterpolarität als *Darstellungsmittel.*

[30] Der Aufsatz Ogdoas als ein Symbol der Auferstehung von Reinhart Staats (*VigChr* 26 (1972), 29-52) ist auch heute noch lesenswert wegen seiner reichen kulturgeschichtlichen Informationen. Im Kleindruck sagt R. Staats S. 38 m.E. völlig richtig: "Es kann demzufolge nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß die Gnosis in ihrer Vorliebe für Zahlenspekulationen auch für ihre Ogdoaslehre etliches aus der philosophisch-heidnischen Umwelt aufgenommen hat, die nicht minder zahlenfreudig war; aber der bewegende theologische Impuls für die Hochschätzung der Acht muß doch aus einer anderen Richtung kommen."

[31] Auch Basilides wird die Formulierung einer Ogdoas zugeschrieben. W. Löhr übersetzt das als Nr. 9 gezählte Fragment so: "Basilides aber nimmt an, daß die Gerechtigkeit und ihre Tochter, der Friede, als Stützen in die Ogdoas eingefügt bleiben." (Winrich A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule* (WUNT 83) 1996, 165) Ich stimme der Übersetzung und zugrundeliegenden Lesung zu, nur möchte ich das δέ unübersetzt lassen: es bezeichnet einen neuen Gedanken, nicht aber einen Gegensatz. Gut verständlich ist, dass Basilides "Gerechtigkeit und ihre Tochter Frieden" als "Stützen" bezeichnete, nämlich als Stützen des rechten Lebens. Schwieriger scheint mir das μένειν. Nimmt man es prägnant als "bestehenbleiben", so liegt wohl eine Kritik an der Ogdoas Valentins vor: Basilides beharrt gegen Valentin auf einer älteren, herkömmlichen Achter-Aufzählung. Diese war nicht so perfekt in Paaren gegliedert, denn griechisch sind "Gerechtigkeit und Friede" Feminina.—Dass die Anhänger des Basilides und die Valentinianer je ihre eigene Ogdoas haben, weiß Irenäus *Haer* II 16,4.

IX,3), die aus der Zeit um 200[32] stammt. Sie ist schlecht erhalten, der hier interessierende Abschnitt sogar nur in Einzelsätzen. Der Satz 55,1-5 verteidigt die Ogdoas als "Ort des Heilwerdens" gegen solche, die gar nicht wissen, was "Heilsein" ist. Deutlicher ist 56,1-9: Valentin, der namentlich genannt wird, und ein "Vollender seines Wegs", dessen Name leider weggefallen ist, lehrten die Ogdoas (als "Ort des Heilwerdens"). Der Autor macht scharf Front gegen Schüler Valentins und des "Vollenders", die nach seiner Ansicht *dieses Gut* (kopt. *piagathon*, der Artikel *pi-* ist demonstrativ) aufgegeben haben und eine εἴδωλον-Frömmigkeit pflegen: gemeint sind Valentinianer, die den kirchlichen Christuskult mitmachen. Der Autor hält die in der Ogdoas formulierte Soteriologie für unvereinbar mit der kirchlichen Christologie, die "Häretiker" dagegen halten die Teilnahme an der kirchlichen Christusverehrung für hinnehmbar.—Valentin selbst hatte dieses Problem noch nicht: Wenn er sich in Rom eine Hausgemeinde suchte, die das Eucharistieformular der Didache gebrauchte, und wenn dort die Oden Salomos gesungen wurden, dann hatte nicht nur das Theologenherz Valentins seine Freude an diesem Gottesdienst, sondern auch sein Dichterherz.

Beobachtungen und Erläuterungen zum 2. Satz

a Καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς Ζωῆς δέκα δυνάμεις λέγει προβεβλῆσθαι,
Auch, sagt er, seien aus "Logos" und "Leben" zehn Kräfte hervorgesprossen,
b καθὼς προειρήκαμεν,
wie wir (= Irenäus) schon vorher erläutert haben,
c ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας δώδεκα,
aus "Mensch" und "Kirche" aber zwölf,
d ὧν μίαν ἀποστᾶσαν καὶ ὑστερήσασαν τὴν λοιπὴν πραγματείαν πεποιῆσθαι.
von denen eine dadurch, dass sie hinabgefallen und in Mangel geraten war, den weiteren Ablauf ausgelöst habe.

Dieser rekapitulierende Satz ist ganz von Irenäus gebildet worden. Nur der Teilsatz 2d, der die "Weisheit" (vergl. Irenäus *Haer* I 2,2) als eine vom Baum heruntergefallene und dadurch in Probleme geratene "Frucht" schildert, könnte ein Bild Valentins aufnehmen. Wenn man dieses Bild Valentin zuschreibt, lehrte (schon) er[33] den "Sophiamythos". Was der kunstreiche

---

[32] Birger A. Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX und X* (Leiden 1981) NHS 15, 120: ".... sometime at the end of the second century or the beginning of the third."

[33] Zu dieser—ich meine in ihrer Relevanz überbewerteten—Frage s. Markschies (Anm. 1) 377f. Markschies erwägt 378, "ob nicht die ganze Erzählung vom mißlungenen Versuch der Engel, einen Menschen zu schaffen (Frgm. 1), als >Hypostasierung< der biblischen Erzählung vom Fall gedeutet werden muß und genau die Stelle ..... einnimmt, an der bei den Valentinianern der Sophia-Fall steht."—Keineswegs ist den

Mythos erzählt, ist gemeint als Beschreibung des Ist-Zustandes: das mit Leidenschaft gesuchte und darum wahnhafte Wissen nimmt alle Menschen gefangen, sie müssen auf den Weg zum Offenbarungswissen der erlösenden γνῶσις *gerufen* werden.

Die "zehn" und die "zwölf Kräfte" zählt Irenäus nicht mehr auf, sondern verweist zurück auf sein Parallelreferat *Haer* I 1,2. Die meisten der dort aufgeführten "Paargenossen" sind so an den Haaren herbeigezogen, dass mir nur eine Erklärung einleuchtend erscheint: Irenäus hat sie mutwillig gebildet, um ein den Valentinianern teures Prinzip zu Tode zu reiten. Also ist die dortige Zahlenspielerei (2 + 2 + 4 + 10 + 12 = 30)—jedenfalls in dieser Form!—seine Erfindung. Seine Absicht ist, die Zahlenspielerei so auszuziehen, dass sie zum reizvollen Rätsel wird. Das ist ihm glänzend gelungen: Generationen von Gelehrten haben sich bemüht, hier Geist und Sinn, Stufenbau und Entsprechungen zu finden. Ich weigere mich, dabei mitzumachen.

Mit seinem Rückverweis auf *Haer* I 1,2 erreicht Irenäus aber noch mehr! Denn er schließt den Bericht dort ab mit der Behauptung: "Dies sind die dreißig Äonen ihrer Irrlehre, verschwiegen und nicht bekanntgegeben. Das ist ihr unsichtbares und pneumatisches Pleroma, dreifach unterteilt in eine Ogdoas (Achtheit), Dekas (Zehnheit) und Dodekas (Zwölfheit)."[34] Daran will Irenäus den Leser erinnern. Folgt man seinem Hinweis, geht man in die Irre: die folgenden Sätze über die "Äonen" und das "Pleroma" sind unverständlich. Das ist natürlich die Absicht des Referenten, der ausdrücklich erklärt hatte, er wolle aufzeigen, wie unbeständig und haltlos (ἄστατος) die Vorstellungen der Gnostiker seien.

Ich ignoriere deshalb den Verstehenshinweis und Interpretationszusammenhang, den Irenäus bietet. Ich prüfe stattdessen zunächst am 7. Satz des Referats, ob er aus sich selbst verständlich ist und die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von "Äonen" bei Valentin erkennen lässt.

Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 7. Satz

a Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ ἅγιον ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας φησὶ προβεβλῆσθαι εἰς ἀνάκρισιν καὶ καρποφορίαν τῶν αἰώνων, ἀοράτως εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσιόν·
b δι οὗ τοὺς αἰῶνας καρποφορεῖν τὰ φυτὰ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Engeln ihr Versuch mißlungen, vielmehr haben sie ihr Werk nachträglich "verpfuscht" (Text in Anm. 50!): es liegt am Hörer, ob er sich als solch ein "Verpfuschter", aber zum Heilwerden Aufgerufener begreift. Eine solche Erzählung (richtiger: ein haggadischer Midrasch des Plurals in Gen 1,26) ist ja wahr nur für den, den sie betroffen macht. Nur dann wird sie angeeignet!

[34] Irenäus *Haer* I 1,3; Übersetzung N. Brox, *Irenäus von Lyon*, Freiburg 1993 (Fontes christiani 8,1) 131.

In diesem Satzgefüge will Irenäus die Pneumatologie Valentins referieren. Noch vor der Übersetzung ist zu fragen: Handelte der referierte Text vom Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in dieser Welt oder von seinem Wirken an Äonen in einem transzendenten Lichtreich, dem Pleroma?[35] Sinnvoll und verständlich sind diese Sätze nur, wenn von konkreten Menschen in dieser Welt die Rede ist: nur bei ihnen kann man vom Fruchtbarwerden und Fruchtbringen sprechen. Der Plural αἰῶνες ist damals durchaus übliche Bezeichnung der Lebenszeit von Menschen.[36] Das Wort ἀνάκρισις (= Verhör) jedoch ist als irritierende Zutat des Kirchenvaters anzusehen und zu streichen. Irenäus referiert als Lehre Valentins:

> Die Wahrheit lasse den Heiligen Geist hervorsprießen, damit Menschen während ihrer Lebenszeit (verhört werden und) Früchte bringen. Dadurch nämlich, dass der Heilige Geist unsichtbar in das Leben solcher Menschen eindringe, trügen diese als ihre Früchte die Gewächse der Wahrheit.

Inhaltlich ist dies die gleiche Lehre vom menschlichen Heil- und Tüchtigwerden, wie sie Valentins 2. Fragment[37] vorträgt. Der Heilige Geist wird innerhalb dieser Lebenszeit in Menschen tätig als Urteilen und Handeln aus der *Gnosis* des in vier "Namen" Meditierten (s. oben S. 9). Dieser Geist ist von sich aus aktiv und bringt in die wahre Existenz: Wo er ins Herz gedrungen ist, da bringt die Wahrheit ihre Früchte, das ist, sie wird empirisch wirksam. Der Bildgebrauch entspricht Valentin, denn er bevorzugt vegetative Bilder (siehe Anm. 20).

Diese Pneumatologie passt gut zu Valentin. Aber referiert Irenäus wörtlich? Zeigt er wirklich den Sprachgebrauch Valentins? Anhand der Fragmente kann man diese Frage nicht klären, denn sie bieten nur einmal den Singular Αἰών[38] als Gottesbenennung. Wenn Irenäus hier den Sprachgebrauch Valen-

---

[35] "Gemeint ist das transzendente Lichtreich, in dem die Äonen sind, die eigentliche Wirklichkeit, die Kontrastgröße zur hiesigen Welt." Fußnote zu Irenäus *Haer* 1,1 erster Satz bei Brox (Anm. 34) 129.

[36] LJS 45: I. lifetime, life. . . . II. long space of time. . . . Die biblischen und patristischen Wörterbücher irritieren mit ihrer (aus Übersetzungsnot geborenen!) Bedeutungsvielfalt des Wortes, s. auch den langen "Exkurs III: Zeitgenössische Aion-Vorstellungen und Valentins Aion-Begriff" bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 157-166.—Wichtig ist, den Plural des Wortes vom Singular-Gebrauch zu unterscheiden. Im Barbelo-Referat des Irenäus steht der Satz "In diesem Zustand ruhen alle (Äonen) und preisen den großen Äon" (*Haer* I 29,3), das entspricht ganz dem bei Valentin vermuteten unterschiedlichen Gebrauch von Singular und Plural.

[37] Ausführlichere Besprechung dieses Fragments weiter unten (S. 25).

[38] Dieses Gottes*epitheton* (fehlorientierend immer noch "Gott Aion" RGG⁴ 1,234; informativer: Jarl Fossum, The Myth of the Eternal Rebirth *VigChr* 53 (1999) 305-315) hat

tins wiedergibt, muss dieser die Gottesbenennung Αἰών (= der Eine, der Lebenszeit gibt) und den Plural αἰῶνες (= die Zeitlichen) als Menschenbenennung dialektisch einander gegenübergestellt haben. Ein solcher Sprachgebrauch würde gut zum intellektuell anspruchsvollen Unterricht Valentins passen. Tatsächlich ist dieser Gebrauch nachweisbar, zwar nicht in den Fragmenten, wohl aber in der Valentintradition, z.B. im "Evangelium der Wahrheit".[39] Dies ist eine irenische Apologie,[40] die entweder von Valentin selbst stammt oder in den engeren Umkreis seiner Schule gehört.

Irenäus hat nicht alle Spuren des valentini(ani)schen Gebrauchs von αἰῶνες getilgt. Er referiert *Haer* I 2,1-4 die "Unfallgeschichte des Äons, der von der Leidenschaft überwältigt wurde und auf der Suche nach dem Vater um ein Haar verloren gegangen wäre wie in einem Gestrüpp" (*Haer* I 3,1). Erst wenn der Äon durch eine jenseitige, ihn begrenzende Kraft zur Umkehr gebracht wird, nimmt das Drama einen guten Ausgang, der alle betrifft:

Valentin aus dem ägyptischen Alexandria mitgebracht. Die Forschung versteht freilich diesen Aion anders, prägnant formuliert bei Holzhausen: "Erst im fünften Fragment des Gnostikers Valentin (2. Jh. n. Chr.) findet sich eine neue Position. Er nennt den Kosmos Abbild (εἰκών) des lebendigen Aion.(Anm. Holzhausen: Vergl. Plato Tim. 92c: die Welt als sichtbares Lebewesen ist Abbild des geistigen Lebewesens.). Aion wird hier zur eigenständigen Wesenheit als Bezeichnnung für den Ideenkosmos." (J. Holzhausen *Das Corpus Hermeticum Deutsch*, Stuttgart 1997, 120). Thema des 5. Fragments ist aber nicht das Verhältnis der Ideenwelt zur Sinnenwelt, sondern die Vertrauenswürdigkeit der (als böse) erlebten Welt, ob nämlich doch ein guter, wohlwollender Schöpfer dahinter steht oder nicht. Für Valentin ist der "Name" eines guten Schöpfers nicht in der Schöpfung vorfindbar, sondern wird *nachträglich* vom Wissen des Gnostikers der Welt, böse wie sie ist, zuerkannt.

[39] NHC I,3 (Attridge NHS 22 und 23). Der Plural αἰῶνες bezeichnet 23,1.16; 24,17; 27,7 die Empfänger der Offenbarung, also irdische Menschen, 38,35 sind wohl präexistente Menschen gemeint. Der Singular als Gottesbezeichnung wie im 5. Fragment Valentins (Clemens Alexandrinus Str. IV 89,6-90,1) auch bei Irenäus *Haer* I, 1,1 (Λέγουσιν . . . εἶναι . . . τέλειον Αἰῶνα προόντα).—Wenn man fragt, woher Valentin diese Ausdrucksweise nahm, muss man an den frühchristlichen Gottesdienst denken, z.B. OdSal 12,4: Dort gibt der Höchste "sein Wort an seine Menschen(generationen)". Die OdSal stammen ziemlich sicher aus dem ägyptischen Alexandria zu Anfang des 2. Jahrhunderts, Valentin ist mit ihnen aufgewachsen (gegen Luise Abramowski (s. Anm. 70 bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 163), die viel späteren *syrischen* Ursprung glaubt beweisen zu können).

[40] Die Schluss-Sätze erweisen das EV eindeutig als eine *Abschiedsschrift*, für die in der Antike Platos Apologie des Sokrates (17a-42a) die literarischen Maßstäbe setzte. Diese Gattung möchte der Autor erfüllen; sogar die koptische Übersetzung lässt noch die Eleganz und Sprachkunst des griechischen Originals spüren. Ich halte die Schrift für das Testament Valentins, was ich hier aber nicht ausführen kann.

"Da lehrte das heilige Pneuma sie alle, die Danksagung zu sprechen (εὐχαριστεῖν) und brachte sie zur vollkommenen Ruhe (ἀνάπαυσις). So wurden, sagen sie, die Äonen äußerlich und innerlich einander gleich: jeder wurde ein Nous, jeder ein Logos, jeder ein rechter Mensch, jeder ein Christus." (*Haer* I 2,6) Das Drama der Äonen ist das gnostische Drama der Menschen.

Valentin konnte durchaus von "Äonen im Pleroma" sprechen. Mit der obigen Interpretation des 7. Satzes wird nur bestritten, dass Valentin unter "Äonen" *undialektisch* und ausschließlich nur Pleroma-Größen versteht. Valentin ist Platoniker und setzt bei seinen Hörern die Kenntnis der doppelten Ontologie Platons voraus: Die Interpretation der Referatsätze 3 bis 6 wird zeigen, dass dort die αἰῶνες einerseits die Lebenszeit konkreter irdischer Menschen benennent, andererseits aber ihre vorweg im Pleroma bestehenden *Präexistenzen.*[41] Die himmlischen αἰῶνες können auch gut

---

[41] Tertullian, ein peinlich genauer Jurist, legt *Adv. Val.* 4,1 (Kroymann CChr.SL 2,756) großen Wert auf Differenzen zwischen Valentin und seinen Schülern. Aber erst in 4,2 belegt er nach einer wohl kalkulierten Abschweifung eine "mutatio", freilich nur eine einzige: "Bald darauf nahm Ptolomäus den gleichen (Weg). Die Äonen, die durch Namen und Abzählbarkeit als persönliche Substanzen unterschieden sind, setzte er außerhalb Gottes fest, während Valentin sie in die Fülle der Gottheit selbst gleichsam wie (lat.: *ut*!) (deren) Empfindung und Leidenschaft und Tätigkeit eingeschlossen hatte." Tertullian konzediert, dass Valentin und Ptolomäus über das Wesen der Äonen das gleiche lehren, nämlich dass sie *in personales substantias distincti* (also kurzgesagt Individuen) seien. Nur darin sieht er die mutatio, dass Valentin und Ptolomäus den Seinsort der praeexistenten Äonen verschieden angesetzt hätten. Mehr will ich an dieser Stelle zu diesem ausgeklügelten Text nicht sagen.

In seiner Spätschrift *Adversus Praxean* (*Prax.* 8 Kroymann CChr.SL 2,1167) stellt Tertullian Valentin als Theologen der "Prolationes" vor, nämlich einen, der "einen nach dem andern Äon aus dem Äon herausgeleitet habe" (*Valentinus alium atque alium Aeonem de Aeone producens*). Um sich selbst als den besseren, klareren Theologen darzustellen, führt er Valentins Lehre genauer aus und setzt dann seine eigene These dagegen, sie lautet: *Protulit enim Deus sermonem ... sicut radix fruticem et fons fluuium et sol radium.* Von Valentin referiert er: *Valentinus προβολάς suas discernit et separat ab auctore et ita longe ab eo ponit ut Aeon patrem nesciat. Denique desiderat nosse nec potest, immo et paene deuoratur et dissoluitur in reliquam substantiam.* "Valentin trennt und scheidet seine Probalas vom Urheber und setzt sie so weit von ihm ab, dass ein (jeder?) Äon den Vater nicht kennt. Auch hätte er (der Äon) ihn ja gerne erkannt, konnte es aber nicht: Fast wäre er sogar aufgefressen und aufgelöst worden in die andere (= nichtgöttliche) Substanz." Hier ist von *menschlicher* Gottesferne und Gottessuche die Rede, also von Äonen in dem Sinne, wie ich ihn für Valentin ansetze, auch wenn Tertullian dies nicht verstehen will (s. *Prax.* 3,6!) und (wenig geschickt!) innerhalb des Satzes vom Plural προβολάς in den (christologisch adaptierbaren) Singular Aeon wechselt. Warum aber die Äonen zunächst im ersten Äon waren und wieso sie nach der Trennung ihren Ursprung nicht kennen und

philosophisch δυνάμεις (wörtlich: Kräfte) genannt werden (Belege F. Sagnard *La Gnose Valentinienne* 637), denn sie sind sozusagen die Potenzen, die noch unentwickelt ("ungestaltet") im Bereich des Möglichen liegen. Von solchen Präexistenzen bzw. Potenzen zu sprechen ist in Valentins Situation platonisch-wissenschaftliche, *aufgeklärte* Ausdrucksweise.

Beobachtungen und Erläuterungen zum 3. Satz

a Ὅρους τε δύο ὑπέθετο,
b ἕνα μὲν μεταξὺ τοῦ Βυθοῦ καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ πληρώματος,
c —διορίζοντα τοὺς γεννητοὺς αἰῶνας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου πατρός—,
d ἕτερον δὲ τὸν ἀφορίζοντα αὐτῶν τὴν μητέρα ἀπὸ τοῦ πληρώματος.

Markschies teilt diesen Satz vom Vorangegangenen ab. "Als einen zweiten, eigenen Abschnitt möchte ich diesen Teil schon deswegen abtrennen, weil hier nicht mehr eine konventionelle Aionengenealogie erzählt wird . . . . . Damit liegt aber ein völlig anderes Genre als in der Pleroma-Genealogie des ersten Abschnitts vor" (Markschies (Anm. 1) 369). Das ist richtig, doch muss man diesen Satz noch sehr viel entschiedener und konsequenter von den Sätzen 1 und 2 absetzen, als Markschies es tut. Denn auch er bezieht die γεννητοὺς αἰῶνας auf die "Pleroma-Genealogie", an die der 2. Satz erinnert; damit geht auch er in die von Irenäus gestellte Falle: die ὅροι sind funktionslos, die Aussage ist unverständlich. Genau dies will Irenäus; schon seine Wahl des Verbs ὑποτίθημι suggeriert, es handle sich um ganz willkürliche Hypothesen. Irenäus will eben nicht informieren, sondern desinformieren.

Eine angemessene Übersetzung ist erst möglich, wenn man herausfindet, welches Thema der ursprüngliche Lehrsatz Valentins hatte, d.h. welche Funktionen er den ὅροι zuschrieb. Die erste Schranke zwischen der "Tiefe" und dem "Rest an Fülle" trennt[42]—so erläutert die Parenthese 3c—den ganzen Bereich des Gewordenen vom ungewordenen "Vater". Thema ist also die Beziehung geschaffener Wesen auf Gott hin. Sinnvoll sind solche Aussagen nur, wo ein bewusstes Gottesverhältnis vorliegt, also bei Menschen. Diese Überlegung ermöglicht eine prägnante Übersetzung:

---

was die "reliqua substantia" ist, die sie zu verschlingen droht, das kann nur der verstehen, der das "Evangelium Veritatis" zur Hand nimmt. Also, meine ich, kannte Tertullian das EV und Valentin als dessen Autor!

[42] Brox (Anm. 34) 207 bietet zweimal das Präteritum "trennte", zweifellos ein Übersetzungs- oder Setzfehler, der aber sehr irritiert.

a Er (= Valentin) hat auch zwei Schranken angesetzt,
b eine zwischen der "Tiefe" und dem, was an Fülle (der Pro-Existenzen) übrig bleibt,
c —sie sperrt die gewordenen Pro-Existenzen (der Menschen) vom ungewordenen Vater aus—,
d eine andere, die ihrer (der Menschen) aller Mutter von der Fülle absperrt.[43]

Valentin setzt die klassische doppelte Ontologie Platos voraus: Im Pleroma existiert zeitlos-unbeweglich, was in der Erfahrungswelt von Zeit und Vergänglichkeit bestimmt ist. Auch jeder Mensch existiert in dieser doppelten Weise: als zeitlose Pro-Existenz und als zeitliche Existenz. Valentin will über den Gottesbezug dieser beiden Existenzweisen belehren; er tut dies, indem er zwei Verben differenziert gebraucht: διορίζω heißt "eine Schranke oder Mauer aufrichten", also "unübersteigbar aussperren", ἀφορίζω aber heißt "abgrenzen", "ein Grundstück abstecken", also nur "trennen". Die beiden ὅροι haben unterschiedliche Funktionen: Die erste Schranke zwischen anfangslosem "Vater" und den geschaffenen Pro-Existenzen trennt schlechthin unerbittlich,[44] nur "Schweigen" anerkennt sie. Die zweite Schranke trennt weniger streng, "ihrer (der Menschen) aller Mutter", also die Menschheit ist durch eine weniger abschließende Schranke vom Pleroma getrennt. Die zweite Schranke bewahrt die Pro-Existenzen in der Fülle,[45]

---

[43] Der letzte Satz weckt Argwohn; in Opposition zum "ungewordenen Vater" erwartet man "ihrer aller Mutter" als eine göttliche Instanz, dann wäre zu korrigieren: "die ihrer aller Mutter zusammen mit der Fülle (nach außen) abgrenzt" entsprechend Irenäus *Haer* I 2,4: "Sie (die Sophia) ist im Pleroma verblieben, doch wurde ihre Enthymesis (ihr allzumenschliches Begehren) zusammen mit der Leidenschaft durch den Horos abgetrennt (ἀφορισθῆναι) . . . ." Ich bleibe aber beim Text, wie Irenäus ihn bietet, und stimme mit Markschies (Anm. 1) 372 überein, dass in diesem Zusammenhang nur von einer, nämlich irdischen Mutter die Rede ist.

[44] Wenn Valentin so lehrte, kann das sogn. Fragment 8 (Hippolyt *Haer* VI 37,7) nicht von ihm stammen, denn dieses schlichte Gedichtchen verwendet das Bild der "Goldenen Kette", um die göttliche "Tiefe" *bruchlos* mit der Erscheinungswelt zu verbinden. Ein durch einen "Horos" abgeriegelter "Bythos" passt dazu nicht, das sieht auch Markschies (Anm. 1) 376 ad 1. Markschies entscheidet sich jedoch dafür, Frag. 8 Valentin zuzuschreiben, ihm aber die Lehre vom doppelten Horos abzusprechen. Eine bruchlose Kontinuität vom göttlichen Ursprung bis hin zu den Einzelerscheinungen ist jedoch stoisch-pantheistische Theologie; kein Gnostiker lehrte so. Markschies konzediert 377: "Ob nun erst Ptolomäus . . . oder schon dieser selbst (= Valentin) den Widerspruch zwischen dem bruchlosen harmonischen Weltaufbau (Frgm. 8) und der Verfallenheit dieser Welt (Frgm. 2/4) durch den Fall der Sophia erklärte, wissen wir nicht".

[45] Wohl nicht von Valentin, sondern aus seiner Schule stammt ein Lehrsatz, den man aus Irenäus *Haer* I 2,5 (SC 264,46) gewinnen kann: τὸ μὲν αἴτιον τῆς διαμονῆς τῶν

während die irdischen Existenzen ausgesperrt sind. Aber diese Schranke gilt als nicht so unüberwindbar wie die erste: da ist Kennen(lernen) und Heimkehr möglich.

Die Lehre von den beiden ὅροι kann mit gutem Grund Valentin zugesprochen werden. Er sicherte damit einerseits die schlechthinnige Transzendenz des fremden, unbekannten Gottes und andererseits die Möglichkeit der *Erinnerung*, wodurch schon in diesem Leben ausreichende, nämlich das Handeln bestimmende Einsicht vom Göttlichen zu gewinnen ist: "Es wirkt nämlich gerade das, was an Gott unsichtbar ist, (mit dem Gottesverständnis des Gnostikers) dahin zusammen, dass (ihm) das Geschaffene vertrauenswürdig ist."[46] Der Gnostiker versteht *und akzeptiert* seine Trennung vom göttlichen Bereich, doch weiß er, dass die zweite Absperrung aufhebbar ist und durch die γνῶσις schon in diesem Leben *in gewisser Weise aufgehoben wird*. Zugleich ist deutlich, dass Irenäus zwar wörtlich referiert, beim Leser aber nicht Verständnis, sondern Kopfschütteln erreichen will.

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 4. Satz

a Καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ πληρώματι αἰώνων προβεβλῆσθαι,
Christus jedoch sei nicht von den (Pro-Existenzen) in der Fülle hervorgesprossen,

b ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἔξω γενομένης κατὰ τὴν μνήμην τῶν κρειττόνων ἀποκεκυῆσθαι μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος·
sondern er sei von der Mutter, die außerhalb (des göttlichen Bereichs) war, gemäß ihrer in einem Schatten liegenden Erinnerung an das Tüchtigere geboren worden;

c καὶ τοῦτον μέν, ἅτε ἄρρενα ὑπάρχοντα, ἀποκόψαντα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν σκιὰν
doch weil ihm eine mannhafte Kraft zu eigen war, sei er aus diesem Schatten völlig herausgekommen (lit: habe ihn von sich abgeschnitten)

d ἀναδραμεῖν εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα.
und im Wettkampf hinaufgelaufen bis in die Fülle.

Abrupt wechselt das Thema, man kann höchstens von einem Stichwortanschluss sub voce "Aion/Pleroma" sprechen. Thema ist nun die Christologie.

αἰώνων (Irenäus: τῆς αἰωνίου διαμονῆς τοῖς ὅλοις) τὸ ἀκατάληπτον ὑπάρχειν τοῦ πατρός· τῆς δὲ γενέσεως καὶ μορφώσεως τὸ καταληπτὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃ δὴ υἱός ἐστιν. Ich übersetze: Der Grund, dass die Pro-Existenzen unwandelbar feststehen, liege im Unfasslichen des Vaters (d.i. seiner eigentlichen Göttlichkeit), der Grund aber, dass sie geboren werden und sichtbare Gestalt annehmen, im Fassbaren, das ist der Sohn.

[46] Dies ist der letzte Satz des 5. Fragments (Clemens Alex. Str. IV 90,1): συνεργεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀόρατον εἰς πίστιν τοῦ πεπλασμένου. Zur Interpretation dieses Fragments und seiner gut belegten Wirkungsgeschichte s. Paul Schüngel, Gnostische Gotteslehren, *VigChr* 53 (1999) 361-394, hier ab 370.

Terminologisch wird dem Kolosserbrief widersprochen; Sätze wie "Denn Gott wollte mit seiner ganzen Fülle (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα) in ihm wohnen" (Kol 1,19) und "Denn in ihm allein wohnt wirklich und leibhaftig die ganze Fülle der Gottheit (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος)" (Kol 2,9) werden abgewiesen. Sachlich wird die kirchliche Vorstellung von der Gottgleichheit des Christus[47] bestritten und eine Gegenlehre entwickelt: Er sei von der "Mutter", die "außerhalb" war, "geboren" worden. Ein klarer Gegensatz zur abgewiesenen These von der Herkunft aus Gott selbst[48] ist dies aber nur, wenn die Mutter hier wie im vorangehenden Satz das Menschengeschlecht ist. Die These der Quelle ist: Jesus wurde geboren als ein Mensch wie alle Menschen. Die "nach außen geratene Mutter" (das Menschengeschlecht bzw. die ihm eigentümliche Sophia) konnte ihm wie allen Menschen nur eine gewisse *Erinnerung*[49] mitgeben an das im Pleroma Geschaute. Diese Erinnerung an das Göttliche heißt "das Tüchtigere",[50] weil es zum tüch-

---

[47] In diesem Anliegen sind sich die Valentinianer einig, weil sie in der (erst viel später definierten!) kirchlichen Lehre eine Aufgabe der Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes sehen. Ihre Formulierungen dazu waren freilich unterschiedlich. "Während die orientalische Schule Christus außerhalb des Pleromas geboren sein ließ, begibt er sich nach der Dogmatik der italischen Schule nur kurz zur Ausgestaltung der Achamoth aus der Welt der Aionen, in die er von Anfang an gehört." (Markschies (Anm. 1) 372). In der Sache sehe ich hier keine Differenzen—die Valentinianer sind doch keine Konzils-Juristen.

[48] Die Formulierung οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ πληρώματι αἰώνων muss eine Verfälschung sein: wie jeder Mensch hatte auch Jesus eine Praeexistenz im Pleroma. In der räumlichen Vorstellung bleibend hatte die Quelle wohl ἐκ μεσότητος (τῶν) αἰώνων bzw. ἐκ τοῦ ἐντὸς πλερώματος (s. Anm. 61!) oder eine ähnliche Formulierung.

[49] Hinter dieser Formulierung steht die platonische Seelenlehre und Erkenntnistheorie. Vergl. hierzu Winrich A. Löhr, Karpokratianisches *VigChr* 49 (1995) 23-48, besonders 24-26. Nach Irenäus *Haer* I 25,1 lehrte Karpokrates, "daß Jesus von Josef gezeugt und den Menschen gleich war, den anderen aber das voraus hatte, daß seine Seele rein und stark war, so daß sie sich an die Dinge erinnerte, die sie bei ihrem Umlauf beim ungezeugten Vater gesehen hatte, und deshalb wurde ihr von ihm eine Kraft hinabgeschickt, damit sie den Weltschöpfern entkommen konnte." In 25,2 wird die Lebensweise derer, die sich erinnern, geschildert: "Jede Seele, die es fertigbringt, so wie Jesu Seele die weltschöpferischen Archonten zu verachten, empfängt ganz genauso eine Kraft, um das gleiche zu tun." (Übersetzung Brox (Anm. 34) 307) Die "mundi fabricatores archontes" sind als die Mächte zu verstehen, die einen entfremdenden Zwang auf die irdischen Menschen ausüben, konkret vor allem das römische imperium. Die Herrschaft der römischen Kaiser erschafft einerseits erst eine von Menschen bewohnbare Welt, andererseits ist sie ein Moloch, der das Göttlich-Weltunabhängige, das keimhaft in jedem Menschen steckt, auffressen will. Dagegen wehrt sich der Gnostiker, entsprechend rigoros ist seine Macht- und Staatskritik, die er freilich klug verschlüsseln muss.

[50] Die hier thematisierte Anthropologie stimmt völlig mit dem 1. Fragment Valentins

tigen Leben befähigt, diese Erinnerung ist jedoch dunkel, "überschattet". Von dieser irdischen Mutter geboren ist auch Jesus einer, der in Irrtum, Wahn und eingebildetem Wissen befangen ist und nur mühsam aus der "Erinnerung an das Tüchtigere" schöpfen kann. Sehr skeptisch wird hier über das Menschsein gelehrt; dies ist die elende Situation aller Menschen, auch Jesu.

Jesus—Valentin sprach nicht von Christus, sondern vom galiläischen Jesus, der in viele Widerstände und Kämpfe verwickelt war!—habe jedoch seine Geburts-Situation überwunden, er habe den Schatten, der sein Bewusstsein verdunkelte, "von sich abgetrennt", d.h. er sei aus diesem Schatten herausgetreten. Das war ihm möglich, weil er ἄρρην war. Das ist nicht als Bezeichnung seines biologischen Geschlechts gemeint, sondern als menschlich-ethische Qualifikation: er war mannhaft-tüchtig. Deshalb war er fähig, das mitgebrachte bzw. erinnerte Göttliche in sich so auszubauen, dass es ihn bestimmte und als weltüberlegene Vollmacht tätig war. Das aber ist genau die soteriologische Vorstellung Valentins:

> Indem er alles ertrug, war er seiner selbst mächtig (ἐγκρατής):
> Jesus erarbeitete Weltüberlegenheit (wörtlich: Gotthaftigkeit).[51]
> Kernsatz des Fragments 3: Clemens von Alexandrien Str. III 59,3

Die These "Weil ihm eine mannhafte Tüchtigkeit zu eigen war, ist er aus diesem Schatten völlig herausgetreten und im Wettkampf hinaufgelaufen bis in die Fülle" entwickelt die gleiche Lehre über Jesus wie das 3. Fragment, sie ist mit Sicherheit Valentin zuzuschreiben. Auch ist klar,

---

(Clemens Alex. *Str.* II 36,2-4) überein. Dort heißt die göttliche Mitgift μείζονα = Größeres und σπέρμα δεδωκότα τῆς ἄνοθεν οὐσίας (der vom oberen Reichtum gegebene Keimling). Ihre ursprüngliche Befähigung können die Menschen aber nicht nutzen, weil die "Engel" (die biologischen und kulturellen Kräfte, die irdisch-bedingte Menschen entstehen lassen) ihr eigenes Werk "verpfuscht" haben. Ich verstehe den Schluss von Fragment 1 so: "Denn Adam, der auf Rechnung (εἰς ὄνομα) des (von ihm zu bewährenden) Menschseins gebildet wurde, setzte (die weltimmanenten Kräfte) in Furcht vor dem vorausexistierenden Menschen (προῶν ἄνθρωπος), da dieser ja (von Gott) in ihn hineingesetzt worden war. Daraufhin erschraken diese (Kräfte) und verdarben augenblicklich ihr Erzeugnis (ἔργον)". Zum "Menschen, der hineingesetzt wurde" bzw. "den wir in uns tragen" s. Anm. 61 und 62!

[51] Das Drei-Worte-Sätzchen θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάζετο formuliert polemisch, denn ἐργάζω bezeichnet mühevolle, alle Kräfte anspannende Arbeit. θεότης ist ein Kunstwort, es kommt im Neuen Testaments nur Kol 2,9 vor und steht hier ohne Artikel. Diskussion der Konjekturvorschläge bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 86, der Übersetzungsmöglichkeiten 91-97. Aber hier ist keine Konjektur nötig, der Text ist in dieser provozierenden Härte gewollt.—Zum Verständnis dieses schwierigen Fragments s. unten Anm. 60 und 61.

warum Jesus als Athlet geschildert ist: das Leben und Lehren Jesu war in der Sicht Valentins ein harter, alle Kräfte fordernder Athletenkampf. Das Leben Jesu war von außen gesehen eine Kette von vergeblichen Anstrengungen und zahllosen Enttäuschungen, es endete im völligen Scheitern; dennoch war es für Valentin das größtmögliche Konkretwerden eines der Welt überlegenen Menschen. "Pleroma" scheint mir daher *in diesem Satzgefüge* einerseits die "Fülle" zu benennen, die einer unter den Bedingungen des irdischen Lebens in seinem Menschsein erreichen kann, andererseits die "Fülle", die auch Jesus im göttlichen Bereich wiederfindet. Ganz wie der 4. Evangelist mit seinem τετέλεσται (Joh 19,30) denkt Valentin eine "Himmelfahrt vom Kreuz aus": das Zeugnis gebende Leben Jesu hatte seinen Höhepunkt, seine "Fülle" im Kreuz, und von dort mündete Jesus in die himmlische "Fülle".

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 5. Satz

a Τὴν δὲ μητέρα ὑπολειφθεῖσαν μετὰ τῆς σκιᾶς κεκενωμένην τε τῆς πνευματικῆς ὑποστάσεως
Weil die Mutter, die unter dem Schatten geblieben war, ganz entleert war von dem (= ihrem) pneumatischen Vorrat,

b ἕτερον υἱὸν προενέγκασθαι, καὶ τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν Δημιουργόν, ὃν καὶ Παντοκρατόρα λέγει τῶν ὑποκειμένων.
habe sie (nur noch) einen andersartigen Sohn herausgepresst, und das sei der Demiurg, den er (= Valentin) auch Allherrscher nennt über alle, die sich (ihm) unterstellen.

c Συμπροβεβλῆσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀριστερὸν ἄρχοντα ἐδογμάτισεν . . . . . .
Mit diesem zusammen sei auch ein "linker Herrscher" hervorgesprossen, wie er (= Valentin) zusammen mit denen lehrt, die fälschlicherweise Gnostiker heißen und über die wir (= Irenäus) später noch mehr sprechen wollen.

Satz 5 schließt nahtlos an den vorangehenden Doppelsatz an, er muss also wohl auch als These Valentins gelten. Irenäus konnte diese These wörtlich referieren, weil sie für ihn puren Unsinn enthielt: die Mutter, die Jesus geboren hat, hat anschließend[52] den Weltschöpfer geboren und den Teufel gleich dazu! Solchen Unsinn kann man ja nicht einmal im Traum erfinden, aber Valentin bietet ihn!

Dass Irenäus hier groben Unsinn liest, liegt zunächst an der kulturellen Unbedarftheit, besser *Kulturfeindschaft*, die er bei seinen Lesern voraussetzt.

---

[52] Diese Zeitstufung steht nicht im Text. Irenäus und auch ein heutiger Leser trägt sie fraglos ein. Aber Valentin kümmert sich hier nicht um einen geschichtlichen Ablauf, sondern treibt theologische Phänomenologie oder Ontologie, und zwar *platonisch-zeitlos*: für Valentin und seine Hörer ist dies die angemessene Rede- und Denkweise.

Valentin nimmt hier wie im Fragment 2 (Clemens Alex. Str. II 36,2-4) das damalige Verständnis der *Götterbilder* auf. Wenn die "Mutter" wie im vorigen Satz das Menschengeschlecht ist, so ist nach diesem Verständnis klar: diese Mutter hat die Götter*bilder* hervorgebracht, denn die Völker aller Zeiten haben je ihre eigenen Götterbilder, Götterdichtungen und -traditionen. Das lernte man bei Homer und Hesiod, das war Allgemeinbildung. Auch unterschied jeder, der in seiner Stadt herumging, sehr genau die jeweiligen Götterdarstellungen (im gallischen, römischen, griechischen, ägyptischen, babylonischen und sogar indischen Stil!) von dem, was da gemeint war. Irenäus aber und seine Leser nehmen die Darstellung für die Sache und ein Wort[53] wie "Demiurg" als die Sache selbst. Dann kommt natürlich grober Unsinn heraus, aber das ist nicht Valentins Schuld.

Um zu verstehen, was Valentin sagen will, ist es notwendig, sich den Sitz im Leben dieser Darlegung klarzumachen. Valentin hielt öffentlichen Unterricht, für den er Honorar forderte. Ein kluger Lehrer achtet darauf, dass es in der Schulstunde hin und wieder auch etwas zu lachen oder wenigstens zu schmunzeln gibt. Hier liefert Valentin den Beweis, dass er ein solcher Lehrer war: er malt ein *Bild*, bei dem der Verständige sich amüsiert. Valentin malt aus, dass die "Mutter" (das Menschengeschlecht), die Jesus geboren und all ihre Kraft in ihn investiert hat, im übrigen so völlig ausgepumpt und schlapp ist, dass sie nur "Nullen" produzieren kann. Diese "Nullen" haben zu geringe Erinnerung an die himmlische Weisheit und machen sich daher auf eigene Faust Gottesvorstellungen, nämlich die vom "Weltbaumeister" (Δημιουργός) und "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher". Das sind bei Valentin Spottnamen, auch wenn sie eine ehrwürdige Tradition haben. Denn die Menschen, die den einen Unsagbaren so benennen, verehren im Grunde einen Machthaber, ja die Macht selbst; Jesus aber und jeder Gnostiker, der von ihm lernt, "erarbeitet Weltüberlegenheit",[54] das

---

[53] Zur (Selbst-)Täuschung durch die "Wörter" siehe EvPhil 11 (NHC II,3 53,23-35 Layton NHS 20 und 21). Nur die beiden Lesungsvorschläge Sevrins und Laytons erbringen einen sinnvollen Text, s. dazu Hans-Martin Schenke, *Das Philippus-Evangelium*, Berlin 1997 (TU 143) 182-186; Schenke resümiert 185: "Die ὀνόματα des Bekenntnisses können nicht das νοεῖσθαι der von ihnen gemeinten ἑστῶτα bewirken, aber wohl ein δεικνύναι derselben."—Vergl. auch NHC I,5 54,2-23 (Attridge NHS 22 und 23).

[54] Fragment 3, s. dazu Anm. 51.—Wenn durch die Ethik Jesu Situationsüberlegenheit, wenn auch nur je und je, tatsächlich erreicht wird, dann kennt jeder, der in dieser Erfahrung steht, den "Vater" Jesu als einen Gott, der den Vorstellungen vom "Allmächtigen" konträr ist. Von daher erklärt sich die "Protestexegese" (K. Rudolph) gegen Ex 20,5 ("denn ich, der Herr, dein Gott, bin ein eifersüchtiger Gott") und noch mehr gegen

ist auch Überlegenheit in Bezug auf die Macht und ihre Träger, die "Archonten" (s. Anm. 49). Ohne eingeübte Weltüberlegenheit, also ohne γνῶσις fürchtet jeder die vielen Machthaber der politischen Welt, vor allem aber: er kennt nur den als Über-Machthaber projezierten Gott[55] und fürchtet ihn. Das letztere ist Valentin besonders wichtig. Denn Gott als "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher" zu verstehen und—was dem Ethiker Valentin noch wichtiger ist—sich ihm zu unterwerfen (5b), das hat nach seiner Ansicht eine Kehrseite: den Teufelsglauben. Angesichts des oft schlimmen Weltlaufs und *der alltäglichen widrigen Erfahrungen* geht die Verehrung des "Allmächtigen" meist zusammen mit der Vorstellung eines "Quertreibers", eines "διάβολος" (einer, der alle und alles gegeneinander aufbringt), eines "linken Fürsten" (einer, der nach links dreht, was rechts gehen sollte). Es verbindet sich die *Vorstellung* vom "allmächtigen Gott" geradezu zwangsläufig mit der *Vorstellung* eines "Teufels", der alles verwirrt und schiefgehen lässt: Valentin zeigt dies auf und illustriert es mit drastischem Humor als eine Zwillingsgeburt![56]

Auch der Gnostiker hat nicht Gott, sondern eine Vorstellung von Gott. Wie kommen Menschen zum Verständnis des ihnen völlig fremden, unbekannten Gottes? Und wieso ist die gnostische Gottesvorstellung überlegen? Valentin lehrt dies im Fragment 2 (Clemens von Alexandrien *Str* II 114,3-6), und zwar zunächst dogmatisch. Es ist die Jesusoffenbarung und nur die Jesusoffenbarung,[57] die zum Verständnis dieses anderen Gottes führt:

Jes 45,5 (bzw. 46,9), wo es in politisch-militärischem Zusammenhang heißt "Ich bin der Herr, und sonst niemand; außer mir gibt es keinen Gott." Hartwig Thyen (RAC 17,196) stellt fest, dass von den Gnostikern kein Bibeltext "so häufig und stets in jedem Sinne negativ beschworen (wird)" wie dieser; RAC 17,197f führt Thyen aus 9 Nag-Hammadi-Schriften 13 Stellen auf. Locus classicus ist Iren. *Haer* I 30,6: "Dann frohlockte Jaldabaoth, brüstete sich mit allem, was sich unter ihm befand, und sprach: "Ich bin Vater und Gott, und über mir ist niemand". Das hörte aber die Mutter, widersprach ihm und rief: "Lüg nicht, Jaldabaoth, denn über dir ist der Vater aller, der Erste Anthropos, und der Anthropos, der Sohn des Menschen!" (Übers. Brox (Anm. 34) 337).

[55] Man möge mir nicht mit dem Einwand kommen, ich argumentiere völlig ahistorisch, nämlich mit Theologenthesen des 19. Jahrhunderts. Erstens haben schon die frühen Sophisten die menschlichen Gottesvorstellungen als Projektionen kritisiert, zweitens hat die gesamte hellenistische Pädagogik dies übernommen, und drittens lässt sich zeigen, dass Valentin den "Unsichtbaren", der zugleich der schlechthin "Unnennbare" ist, sorgfältig unterschieden hat von den Vorstellungen, die die Menschen sich machen (und machen müssen).

[56] Bei den Schülern Valentins wurde das humorige Bild des Meisters zur Selbstverständlichkeit, auf die man ohne Erklärung anspielen kann, so im Brief des *Ptolomäus an Flora* 7,9 (Quispel SC 24bis 72f).

[57] Barbara Aland zum Fragments 13 des Valentinschülers Herakleon: "Die Viehverkäufer

> Einer nur ist gut! Sein offenes Sprechen—nämlich durch den Sohn—ist sein öffentliches Erscheinen.

Aber eine Lehre führt niemals zu einem qualitativ überlegenen Gottesverständnis, mit Worten allein ist da nichts zu erreichen. Valentin wechselt darum von der dogmatischen Lehre in den psychologisch-pragmatischen Bereich: Das gnostische Verständnis Gottes stammt nicht aus einer Gottes*lehre* (oder gar Gottesspekulation), sondern aus (qualitativ anderer) Gottes*erfahrung*. Valentin beschreibt *phänomenologisch* die Psyche der Menschen. Er schildert in einem Vergleich des Menschenherzen mit einer verkommenen Herberge das alltägliche Selbst-Erleben der Menschen: die verschiedenen Antriebe und Wertvorstellungen in einem Menschen (seine πνεύματα) stehen so im Streit miteinander, dass sie ihr eigenes "Haus" verkennen und es ruinieren. Menschen mit solchen Herzen fehlt Selbst-Erkenntnis und πρόνοια, d.h. sie haben keinen ihr Handeln lenkenden Vorausblick. Ein solches "unreines Herz", das sich selbst verkennt, wird "rein" nicht durch Worte und Belehrung, sondern duch ein Geschehen. Der Schluss von Fragment 2 formuliert:

> Wenn aber der Vater, der allein gut ist, es (das Herz) wie ein Arzt besucht, wird es geheilt und mit Licht durchstrahlt. Auf diese Weise wird derjenige (mit gutem Grund) selig gepriesen, der ein derartiges Herz hat: Er wird Gott schauen.[58]

Der "einzige, der gut ist", ist auch "der allein gute Vater", seine Tätigkeit bezeichnet das Verb ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. Ich verstehe es als Fachwort der Ärzte,[59] es bedeutet "ärztlich visitieren". Valentin erwartet keinen wunderhaften Vorgang, der sozusagen mit einem Schlag heilt und alle Dämonen ver-

---

und Geldwechsler, die in das ἱερόν eingedrungen sind, symbolisieren dann die Situation dieses Menschen in der Welt—d.h. grundsätzlich die jedes Menschen. Er hielt sein ἱερόν nicht rein, sondern ließ Fremde (207,5) in es eindringen, ließ also seine Gabe verkümmern. Jesus—und es ist zu betonen, erst Jesus und nur Jesus—treibt die Fremden heraus. . . . . Durch die Kraft von Kreuz und Geist wird daher "die Gemeinde bereitet", wird aus der Höhle von Räubern und Händlern, die der Mensch vor Christus darstellt, das Haus des Vaters (207,20ff). Die Parallele zu Valentin, der das Herz mit einer von üblen Rauf- und Trunkenbolden besudelten Herberge verglich, ist deutlich (Frg. 2). Hier wie dort kommt die Rettung allein von dem Soter (bzw. dem Vater), ohne den das Herz nichts als eine wüste Höhle bleiben müßte." (in: M. Krause, *Gnosis und Gnostizismus* (NHS 8), 161.)

[58] Valentins 2. Fragment ist eine Kommentierung, ja Korrektur des Matthäusverses, vergl. Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 245 Anm. 1: "Thus the passage is an interpretation of Mt 5:8, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

[59] Die vielen anderen Möglichkeiten s. Markschies (Anm. 1) 77f.

treibt. Er setzt vielmehr auf das *Einüben* der Weisung Jesu und ein allmähliches Starkwerden in ihr so wie die antiken Ärzte auf Leibesübungen und Diäthalten setzten. Wer die Lehren Jesu (und die Vorträge Valentins!) aufmerksam hört, das Gehörte beherzigt und nicht nach dem Splitter im Auge des Nächsten, sondern nach dem Balken im eigenen Auge sucht und daran arbeitet, ihn *bei sich* herauszuziehen (Mt 7,35 Lk 6,41f EvThom 10), der findet zur πρόνοια, die ihn heilt. Ein solcher wird mit "Licht", nämlich heilender Selbsterfahrung durchstrahlt; seine Antriebe werden aus einem Knäuel miteinander kämpfender Bestien zu einem Team,[60] das miteinander kooperiert. Die Gotteserkenntnis vom "allein guten Vater" ist nur dann anderer Gotteserkenntnis überlegen, wenn sie zur Integration der inneren Antriebe[61] führt und auf dieser Basis situationsüberlegen initiativ werden lässt; sie braucht *diese Bewährung*[62] *und Bewahrheitung*. Denn diese Erkenntnis Gottes ist wesentlich eine Bevollmächtigung, sie ist die Entdeckung der

---

[60] Dieses Bild stammt von Plato (Rep IX 588b-589b). Dort werden ein großes, sehr wildes, manchmal auch zahmes Tier, das seine vielen Köpfe beliebig wechseln kann, ein kleinerer Löwe und ein Menschlein, *in eins zusammengefasst*, als *Modell* der menschlichen Seele angesetzt. Dieses Gleichnis war bei den Gnostikern sehr beliebt: EvThom 7 spielt darauf an, und NHC VI,5 ist eine zur admonitio gewandelte Fassung, leider in jämmerlicher Übersetzung. Gegen Markschies (Anm. 1) 56 Anm. 15 letzter Satz bin ich der Ansicht, dass Valentin sehr wohl dieses Bild Platos kennt und auch seine Klienten es kennen.

[61] Hippolyts Valentinreferat *Haer* X 13 ist von problematischem Wert. Der Anfang ist zweifellos von Irenäus *Haer* I 11,1 abhängig, nicht aber der soteriologische Teil: Τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἐκτὸς πληρώματος κατεληλυθέναι ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ ἀποπλανηθέντος πνεύματος, ὃ κατοικεῖ <ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ>, ὃν σωζόμενόν φησι τούτου χάριν τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος. τὴν δὲ σάρκα μὴ σῴζεσθαι θέλει, <δερμάτινον χιτῶνα> ἀποκαλῶν καὶ <ἄνθρωπον φθειρόμενον> (Marcovich PTS 25 391,1-5). Ich übersetze: Christus sei aus dem Inneren der Fülle entlassen worden (pass. div!), um das in (Selbst-)Täuschung geratene Pneuma zu retten. Dieses wohnt (als Fremdling?) "in dem Menschen, den wir in uns tragen", auch werde dieser, so lehrt er, um des darin Wohnenden willen gerettet. Das Fleisch will er nicht gerettet werden lassen, er nennt es "aus Fell gefertigten Leibrock" und "verpfuschten Menschen".—Die Redeweise ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ stammt aus dem in der vorigen Anmerkung genannten Gleichnis Platos; hier ist Platos dreidimensionale (nicht dreifach gestufte!) Seelenlehre übernommen mit der entscheidenden Korrektur einer vierten, überirdischen Instanz (s. Anm. 50!). Diese Thesen sind valentinisch, weil der ἄνθρωπος φθειρόμενος dem Satz im 1. Fragment entspricht, dass die Engel ταχὺ τὸ ἔργον ἠφάνισαν. Auch die πλάνη-Vorstellung ist valentinisch.

[62] Das meinten jene Valentinianer, von denen Irenäus—verleumderisch das Thema ins Sexuelle verschiebend—berichtet: "Man kann nach ihrer Meinung nur so gerettet werden, daß man alles durchmacht, wie auch Karpokrates das vertreten hat." (*Haer* I 31,2, vergl. 25,4: "Die Seelen müssen im Zuge ihrer Wanderung in Leiber jedes Leben und jedes Tun durchmachen—. . . .—, so daß nach Aussage ihrer Schriften ihren Seelen

"Meerestiefe an Vollmacht",[63] die das Leben in eine neue Qualität hebt. Davon wissen all diejenigen, die nur den "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher" und Weltbaumeister kennen, nichts; ihre Gotteserkenntnis ist Unwissen und "eine Frucht des Mangels" (Irenäus *Haer* I 17,2 und 19,1).

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 6. Satz

Καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
a ποτὲ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ συσταλέντος ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῶν, συναναχυθέντος τοῖς ὅλοις προβηβλῆσθαί φησι, τουτέστιν τοῦ Θελητοῦ,
b ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναδραμόντος εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα, τουτέστιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
c ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

Dieser Text ist—zumindest in seinem ersten Teil—unsinniger Schwulst, und darum ergibt eine Übersetzung nur Unsinn. Es ist aber zu erkennen, dass Irenäus die προβηβλῆσθαι ἀπό-Konstruktion einsetzt, um drei Aussagen über Jesus zusammenzuzwingen. Wenn man diese zusammenzwingende Konstruktion streicht, ergibt sich folgender klarer Sinn:

Und von dem bekannten Jesus sagt Valentin
(a) an einer Stelle: Er ist von der Mutter (= dem Menschengeschlecht/der irdischen Σοφία) her klein und (seinem Schicksal nach) mit all den anderen (Menschen) zusammengeflossen, daher ist er der "Erwünschte",
(b) an anderer Stelle: Er ist in die Fülle hinaufgelaufen, daher ist er der "Gesalbte",
(c) und an einer dritten Stelle: Aus ihm[64] sind "Mensch" und "Kirche" entsprossen.

---

beim Auszug (aus dem Leib) absolut nichts mehr fehlt, nachdem sie das Leben in jeder Hinsicht durchgemacht haben." (Übersetzung Brox (Anm. 34) 353 und 311).

[63] Porphyrius, *Abst.* I 42,2/3, bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 411-413: ὅπου δὲ βυθὸς ἐξουσίας, πάντα δέχονται καὶ οὐδενὸς μιαίνονται. Dies ist die Pointe eines tiefsinnigen, von Porphyrius anonym überlieferten und vehement abgelehnten Vergleichs der Fähigkeit des Weltmeers und der Menschen, Schlimmes zu ertragen und Übel zu "verdauen". Dieser Vergleich ist ebenso wie Valentins 3. Fragment als *Allegorie* ausgeführt, in der "essen" und "verdauen" das Bewältigen der Lebensschwierigkeiten meinen. Die Allegorie ist möglich, weil die Sprachen (die griechische ebenso wie die modernen europäischen) die Metaphern kennen, dass jemand an schlimmen Erfahrungen "zu kauen hat" oder "sie erst verdauen muss". Ich übersetze das 3. Fragment erläuternd: "Indem er alles ertrug, war er seiner selbst mächtig: Jesus erarbeitete (so seine) Weltüberlegenheit/Gotthaftigkeit. So groß war in ihm die Kraft seiner Selbstbestimmung (ἐγκρατεία ist hier nicht die christliche Enthaltsamkeit!), dass die "Nahrung" in ihm nicht aufgelöst wurde (und dadurch ernährend seine Existenz bestimmte). Er trug nämlich das Aufgelöstwerden (τὸ φθείρεσθαι: die Entfremdung vom Existenzkern) in gar keiner Weise in sich." Vorausgesetzt ist wieder die Anthropologie vom ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος und dem darin wohnenden unweltlichen Pneuma (s. Anm. 60 und 61).

[64] Aus dieser These hat Irenäus das προβηβλῆσθαι ἀπό, das er auch den beiden ande-

Irenäus möchte im 6. Satz belegen, dass Valentin drei verschiedene, sich widersprechende Definitionen über Jesus vorgetragen habe. Nun ist aber These (c) nichts als eine (wohl von Irenäus gebildete) Variation von Teilsatz (e) im 1. Satz des Irenäus-Referats, These (b) hat Irenäus aus dem 4. Satz (d) des Referats übernommen, und These (a) ist ein Topos, ein Allerweltssatz innerhalb des Christentums. Auf keinen Fall widersprechen sich diese Sätze, auch wenn Irenäus das möchte. Dazu nennt Irenäus Titel Jesu,[65] um noch mehr Verwirrung zu schaffen. Hier hat sich Irenäus sein Polemikerhandwerk zu leicht gemacht:[66] er konstruiert einen Rätseltext und behauptet darin Widersprüche, die es bei Valentin gar nicht gibt.

Erläuterungen zum 8. Satz

Nach dem Referat über Valentins Lehre vom Heiligen Geist schließt Irenäus mit dem Sätzchen Ταῦτα μὲν ἐκεῖνος, das nur lateinisch als "Haec autem ille" überliefert ist. Sprachlich ist dies eine Ellipse: der Name Valentins wird vorsätzlich ausgelassen. Dies und die Wahl der beiden Demonstrativa sind Zeichen äußerster Verachtung. Die Formel stammt aus der Gerichtsrede; man schloss mit ihr ein Plädoyer, das eine gegnerische Aussage desavouieren sollte. Genau dies ist hier die Absicht des Referenten: In der Einleitung ruft Irenäus den Leser als Richter auf, der entscheiden soll, was von diesem Valentin zu halten ist. Als Leser und Richter setzt er einen Kirchenchristen ein, der sich an das Elementarste hält, das er kennt: an die trinitarische (Tauf-)Formel vom Vater, Sohn und Heiligen Geist. Danach hat Irenäus sein Referat aufgebaut. Er bietet als Valentins Lehre vom Vater die wunderliche Darlegung einer Äonen-Genealogie, als Valentins Lehre vom Sohn ganz unverständliche und unsinnige Einzelstücke, zuletzt eine kurze, nur mit einem Wort verfälschte Lehre vom Heiligen Geist, die aber

---

ren Sätzen aufgezwingt. Andererseits hat er hier Subjekt und Objekt vertauscht, um Unsinn zu erzeugen; ich mache diese Vertauschung rückgängig.

[65] Den Christustitel hat Valentin wohl nicht verwendet, beim Titel Theletos ("Der von Gott erwünschte Mensch") mag das anders sein, ich weiß es nicht.

[66] Markschies (Anm. 1) 375: "Irenäus hat seinem Leser damit nicht nur gezeigt, daß zwei oder drei Valentinianer nicht dasselbe lehren, sondern daß *ein* Valentinianer, wenn er lehrt, zwei- oder dreimal nicht dasselbe lehrt. Damit löst er am Ende seines Paragraphen die Ankündigung des Beginns so überdeutlich ein, daß ihm der heutige kritische Leser die Argumentation kaum noch abnimmt."—Irenäus schreibt nicht für kritische Leser, weder für damalige noch für heutige, sondern er wendet sich ausschließlich an "Insider", die Bestärkung dafür wollen, dass sie ganze Wahrheit besitzen. Literatursoziologisch sind diese Bücher Agitation, sie dienen dem Bischof der bischöflichen Machtsicherung.

im von Irenäus gebotenem Kontext unverständlich ist. Es macht gar nichts, wenn man etwas nicht versteht, nein, gerade so ist es das beste Argument!

Es bleibt das Fazit zu ziehen. Irenäus verfügt über zuverlässige, Valentins "Originalton" einfangende Dokumente. Er tradiert einiges daraus, aber nur zu agitatorischem Gebrauch: er will Valentin lächerlich machen. Dieser ist ihm kein Diskussionspartner. Vor allem teilt er nicht Valentins Ausgangspunkt, dass jeder Mensch sein Gottesverhältnis selbst erkunden müsse und nur im eigenen Innern zu Einsicht und Vollmacht finden könne. Denn für Irenäus ist "Wahrheit" nicht ein erst im Lebensprozess gefundenes, ja errungenes Können und Verhalten, so dass es so viele Wege zu Gott gibt wie es Menschen gibt, sondern für ihn ist Wahrheit eine Summe von Sätzen, die in der Kirche anerkannt sind. "(Und) bezüglich der Erkennbarkeit und des Besitzes der Wahrheit war der Bischof in Gallien sich unbedingt sicher und zweifelsfrei. Die Wahrheit war ihm nämlich auf völlig unproblematische Weise evident, weil Gott sie den Menschen nachweislich mitgeteilt hat. Er meinte, nur auf die Tatsachen verweisen zu müssen, um ein für allemal jede Konkurrenz zur kirchlichen Lehre ausgeschlossen zu haben." (Brox (Anm. 34) 102). Welche Tatsachen das sind, kann jeder am Taufbekenntnis ablesen; *Haer* I 10,1 zählt Irenäus sie in kaskadenhafter Weise auf. Diese Tatsachen lehre jeder christliche Lehrer, der schwach begabte Prediger könne nichts weglassen, der begabte Prediger könne nur Zierrat und Folgerungen zufügen; und alle Ortskirchen unter der Sonne lehrten genau diese Tatsachen.

Irenäus ist ein schrecklicher, aber erfolgreicher Vereinfacher: Was nicht der kirchlichen regula fidei entspricht, muss man denunzieren und lächerlich machen. In dieser Weise verfährt er mit Valentin, er ist durchaus stolz auf seine Leistung. In der Einleitung des 4. Buches seiner "Überführung und Widerlegung der fälschlich sogenannten Gnosis" klopft er sich anerkennend auf die eigene Schulter, wenn er schreibt: "Denn die, die vor uns in dieser Sache tätig waren,—und von denen waren einige durchaus tüchtiger als wir!—konnten doch nicht hinreichend denen widersprechen, die sich von Valentin herleiten. Sie kannten nämlich nicht deren Glaubensmaßstab, den (erst) wir mit größter Sorgfalt im 1. Buch für dich dargelegt haben."[67] Hier bestätigt Irenäus, wie er in *Haer* I 11 (bzw. *Haer* I 1-9)

[67] Irenäus *Haer* IV Praef. 2: "*Quapropter hi, qui ante nos fuerunt, et quidem multo nobis meliores, non tamen satis potuerunt contradicere his qui sunt a Valentino, quia ignorabant regulam ipsorum, quam nos cum omni diligentia in primo libro tibi tradidimus.*" Angeredet ist der (fiktive) Empfänger der als Lehrbriefe stilisierten Bücher, auch der Verweis auf die *meliores ante*

verfuhr: er hat Lehren Valentins (bzw. seiner Schüler) willkürlich herausgesucht und sie (nicht ohne Verfälschungen, besonders der literarischen Gattung) so aufgereiht, dass etwas Ähnliches wie ein "Credo" Valentins (bzw. seiner Tradition) herauskam: es ergibt sich eine Aufstellung von so irrsinnigen und fantastischen Glaubensartikeln, dass dagegen die orthodoxe regula fidei als ein Muster von Einsicht und Vernunft erscheint. So treibt man Demagogie und Agitation. Glücklicherweise verfuhr der Kirchenvater aber meist so simpel, dass man eine ganze Menge dessen, was Valentin formulierte und lehrte, bei Irenäus wiederfinden kann.

D-53127 *Bonn*, Waldauweg 20

---

nos ist vor allem, wenn nicht ausschließlich literarisches Klischee (s. dazu Markschies (Anm. 1) 380 Anm. 307-309).

DIE THEOLOGISCHE BEDEUTUNG DES ὁμοχρόνως: ZU *ADVERSUS ARIUM ET SABELLIUM* VON [GREGOR VON NYSSA]

VON

ANNELIESE MEIS

Diese kurze Studie beschäftigt sich mit der theologischen Bedeutung der Vokabel ὁμόχρονος, die weder im Gesamtwerk Gregors von Nyssa noch sonstwo in der patristischen Literatur häufig zu finden ist, vielleicht Theodoretus von Kyrrhos ausgenommen.[1] Für sein Verständnis ist es wichtig, die "Gleichzeitigkeit", die diese Vokabel ausdrückt, nicht mit Simultaneität zu verwechseln, noch als Synchronität zu verkennen, wie es allenfalls die genannte Zeitdimension (χρόνος) vermuten lässt, was jedoch die eigenartige Zusammensetzung mit ὁμο- verbietet. Da ὁμο von ἅμα herkommt,[2] ist hier eine Art *Zusammen-sein* verschiedener Elemente der Wirklichkeit im Spiel, das keinen Abstand zwischen diesen Elementen kennt, jedoch deren jeweiliges Anderssein nicht aufgibt.[3]

Gregor von Nyssa verwendet das Adverb ὁμοχρόνως im *Hohenliedkommentar* an einer entscheidenden Stelle, um die origenistische Idee der Präexistenz der Seelen scharf zurückzuweisen, nachdem er diese in *An et res* und *HomOp* mit einer etwas weitschweifigen Beweisführung bereits verneint hatte, ohne die Zeitkategorie zu verwenden.[4] Wenn der Gebrauch des ὁμοχρόνως für

---

[1] GNO III/1, 76, 7; VI, 241, 6; IX, 55, 22; Cf. LAMPE, 962. Es handelt sich um eine Studie, die das Problem des ὁμοχρόνως zu erweitern sucht, wie es in seiner Bedeutung für die Auseinandersetzungen mit Origenes im 4. Jahrhundert entdeckt wurde. Cf. A. Meis, Das Paradox des Menschen im Canticum-Kommentar Gregors von Nyssa und bei Origenes, in W. A. Bienert, U. Kühneweg (Hhrg), *ORIGENIANA SEPTIMA. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Leuven 1999) 469-496.

[2] ὁμοῦ: GNO III/1 83,12; ἅμα: GNO III/1, 74, 12; 74, 13; 74, 16; 76, 3; 82 10. Cf. P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des Mots (Paris 1990) 68; M. Theunissen, Gleichzeitigkeit, HWP III (1973) 674.

[3] Cf. H. Schulz, Gleichzeitigkeit, LThK IV (1995) 745-46; M. Theunissen, o. c., 674-675.

[4] *CtCom.* H VII: GNO VI 241, 6. Cf. *ORIGENIANA SEPTIMA*, 486-494.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

den Nyssener die Tatsache unterstreicht, dass Leib und Seele "gleichzeitig" ins Dasein treten, könnte es mehr als ein Zufall sein, wenn der Verfasser des *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* sich einer eigenartigen Anspielung auf die Seele dort bedient, wo es sich um eine Schrift handelt, deren Sinnspitze sich ausdrücklich gegen die Origenisten des IV Jahrhunderts zu richten scheint.[5] Von grösserer Bedeutung jedoch scheint die Tatsache zu sein, dass die Vokabel ὁμόχρονος nicht nur ausdrücklich erwähnt, sondern auch christologisch-trinitarisch ausgearbeitet und untermauert wird.

Welchen Sinn erhält nun der Gebrauch dieses schlichten Wortes in der Beweisführung des heute mehr denn je in Frage gestellten Werkes *Ar et Sab*?[6] Wie könnte dies als theologischer Widerhall einer antiorigenistischen Spitze verschiedener Kontroversen im IV. Jahrhundert verstanden werden?[7] Solche und ähnliche Fragen sucht die folgende Analyse kurz zu beantworten, in dem sie vom kontroversgeschichtlichen Hintergrund dieser Schrift ausgeht, um dann den Einzelheiten der theologischen Bedeutung des ὁμοχρόνως auf die Spur zu kommen.

---

[5] J. Daniélou, L'*Adversus Arium et Sabellium* de Gregoire de Nysse et l'Origénisme Cappadocien, *RSR* 54 (1966) 61-66.

[6] Eine bedeutende Anzahl Experten verneint es heute, diese Schrift Gregor von Nyssa zuzuschreiben, sich auf K.Holl, Über die Gregor von Nyssa zugeschriebene Schrift "Adversus Arium et Sabellium", *ZKG* 25 (1904) 380-398 berufend, u.a. R. Hübner, Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra, in M. Harl, *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Gregoire de Nysse* (Leiden 1971) 211, während W. Jaeger, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*, Leiden 1966, 27; G. Müller, GNO III/1; J. Daniélou, o. c., *supra*, n. 5 die Urheberschaft Gregors befürworten. Cf. B. Pottier, *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse: étude systématique du "Contra Eunome"*, Bruxelles 1994, 283, n. 43; M. van Parys, Exégèse et theologie trinitaire, *Irenikon* 43 (1970) 375-78; A. Ritter, Das Konzil von Konstantinopel, R. Hanson, M. Simonetti, während H. Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie. Der Dialog Gregors von Nyssa de Anima et Resurrectione* (Patrologia, Beiträge zum Studium der Kirchenväter, 1) (Frankfurt am Main-Bern-New York-Paris 1991) unbefangen eine bedeutungsvolle Stelle als Beleg der Gotteserkenntnis durch den Logos heranzieht, und M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique. Etudes des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris 1983), trotz ihrer Absage, einige Wege offen zu lassen scheint. Eine ausführliche Analyse, die über diese Ungewissenheit entscheiden würde, ist bisher nicht erarbeitet worden. Deshalb wird auch hier nicht beabsichtet, darüber zu entscheiden.

[7] Während J. Daniélou, o. c., *supra*, n. 5 als Einziger auf den Text selbst eingeht, den er schrittweise aufschlüsselt, beziehen sich die übrigen Experten auf eine Textauslegung, die von aussen her den Text in Frage stellt.

1. *Kontroversgeschichtlicher Hintergrund des Adversus Arium et Sabellium*

Der kontroversgeschichtliche Hintergrund des *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* scheint, auf den ersten Blick recht einfach zu sein. Als Gegner werden Schüler des Arius und Sabellius ausdrücklich genannt und widerlegt.[8] Einige seltsame Daten jedoch, wie die Beifügung eines "Achillios" zum Namen der Arius, die Bezeichung der Sabellianer als υἱοπάτωρ und vor allem die Nennung einer unbekannten Person, an die der Verfasser sich ausdrücklich als jemand richtet, der zwischen den zwei häretischen Extremen hin und hergezogen wird, oder sich sogar beiden gleichgesinnt erklärt, lassen ein verstrickteres Problemfeld ahnen. Dieses scheint sich tatsächlich am Zeitbegriff zu orientieren, weshalb vor allem darauf zu achten ist, wie der Verfasser diesen Begriff verwendet, welche Bedeutung er ihm für das Verständnis der beiden Hauptirrlehren beimisst, und inwieweit eine "origenistische" Neufassung im Spiel stehen könnte.

a. *Darstellung der Lehre des Arius*

Die Stellungnahme zur Irrlehre des Arius lässt keine Zweifel darüber, dass diese Lehre den Sohn als Geschöpf (κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα) betrachtet, wodurch jenes <ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν> des Canons von Nikaia anklingt, das auf ein *vorher*, also eine Zeit hinweist, wo der Sohn nicht war: <πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν>, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο.[9] Obwohl Arius den Sohn sehr nahe an Gott heran und von den übrigen Geschöpfen abrückt, taucht hier ein zeitliches Moment auf, das nur chronologisch gedeutet werden kann.[10]

b. *Stellungnahme zu Sabellius*

Wenn der Verfasser dann feststellt, dass "die Sabellianer" es wagen, die Hypostase des Sohnes zu unterdrücken und glauben, dass der "eine Vater unter zwei Namen ausgesagt wird, ihn also υἱοπάτορα nennen",[11] legt er dar, dass sie den Namen des Sohnes zum Werkzeug herabsetzen, um die Wirklichkeit des Vaters zu versinnbildlichen. Damit taucht neben dem jahwistischen Monotheismus jene griechische Idee ἀρχή der Gottheit auf, die auch den Hintergrund der arianischen Lehre darstellt, wenn sie fordern,

[8] GNO III/1, 71, 2-10.

[9] DS 126.

[10] Cf. E. P. Meijering, HN ΠΟΤΕ ΟΤΕ ΟΥΚ HN Ο ΥΙΟΣ. A discussion on time and eternity, *VC* 28 (1974) 161-168.

[11] GNO III/1, 71, 7-8.

dass die Gottheit so transzendent als möglich gedacht werden muss, um jeden Kontakt, jede Mischung mit der sinnlichen Welt zu vermeiden, eine Gottheit, die aber in sich und nach aussen hin vollständig beziehungslos ist, was dann auch den steten Rollenwechsel derselben grundlegt. Das schliesst nicht nur eine seinsgemässe Verbindung zwischen Gott und dem Menschen vollständig aus, sondern es wird jene konkrete Zeitspanne verneint, die sich besonders für das sabellianische Verständnis der Menschwerdung als problematisch erweist.

c. *Des Verfassers eigene Problemstellung*

Für den Verfasser selbst ist es äusserst wichtig (wie auch in den Werken Gregor von Nyssas) "den schmalen Weg zu finden, der zwischen beiden genannten Extremen hindurch zum Leben führt, ohne der Furcht zu verfallen",[12] da Christus sagt "Ich bin der Weg, die Wahrheit und das Leben". Deshalb weist der Verfasser zunächst beide Extreme scharf zurück, wenn er erklärt: "Der Sohn ist Sohn des Vaters, nicht Geschöpf"; "Er hat keinen Anfang (ἀρχή), sondern ist ewig (ἀΐδιος)" und "herrscht als eigene Hypostase zusammen mit dem Vater (κατ' ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν συμβασιλεύσει τῷ πατρί) auf ewig (ἀτελειτήτοις αἰῶσι)",[13] das heisst, "ohne Ende".

Der Verfasser verneint hiermit die arianische Zeitspanne, aber auch ihre sabellianische Abwesenheit, bringt jedoch einen neuen Begriff ins Spiel, die Ewigkeit, die als solche von der Zeit verschieden, aber einer Verbindung zu dieser nicht völlig fremd ist. Mehr noch, mit "der Existenz des Sohnes als eigene Hypostase" und sein "Mitherrschen mit dem Vater", klingt eine Art "*Gleichzeitigkeit*" an, die im folgenden ausführlich erklärt und ausgeweitet wird, wenn die Beziehung des *Ursprungs* zum *Ende* und sein Zusammenfallen im *Heute* näher dargelegt wird.

2. *Die Gleichzeitigkeit von Ursprung und Ende im "Heute"*

Der Verfasser stellt zunächst fest, dass alles was eines Ursprunges entbehrt, ungezeugt ist (ἀγέννητος). Dem Zeugnis der Schrift gemäss jedoch ist "der Sohn gezeugt" und eine Zeugung schliesst ihrerseits die Idee der

---

[12] GNO III/1, 71, 10-11: δίεισι δὲ μέση τις ὁδὸς στενὴ καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

[13] GNO III/1, 72, 3-4: Für Hübner liegt hier eine klare Zurückweisung des Markell von seiten des Verfassers des *Ar et Sab*, was gegen die Echtheit der Schrift spricht, da Hübner eine grosse Abhängigkeit Gregors bezüglich Markell nachzuweisen versucht.

ἀρχή ein. Darum wird zu recht gefragt: "wie kann der Sohn es wagen zu sagen, dass er ἄναρχος, ohne Ursprung, ist, wenn *Sohn-sein* bereits gezeugt sein" bedeutet?[14] Dieser Frage geht nun der Verfasser nach, wenn er den *Ursprung*, als auf ein *Ende* hin ausgerichtet, untersucht.

a. *Ursprung und Ende*

Gewiss ist es wahr, dass philosophisch gesehen, der Sohn, wenn er einen Anfang hat (ἀρχή) auch ein Ende haben muss (τέλος), womit ohne Zweifel ein Echo auf Origenes anklingt.[15] Aber die Schrift gibt dies auch zu verstehen, fährt der Verfasser fort, wenn 1 Kor 15, 24 erklärt, dass "er sich dem Vater unterwirft".[16] Da der Vater ausserdem ungezeugt, einzig, "voll Weisheit und Kraft", und Christus die Weisheit Gottes ist, wie kann es sein, dass des Sohnes Zeugung sich als einzig erweist? Muss diese Zeugung nicht notwendig "durch die Zeit begrenzt sein"? Deshalb wäre es möglich zu glauben, dass der Sohn noch nicht existierte, bevor er gezeugt wurde, und nachher ins Nichts zurückfliessen müsste. Das ist aber falsch, behauptet der Verfasser.

Daraufhin erklärt er dann, dass "wenn die Zeugung des Heilandes unter das Geschick der Zeitlichkeit fällt (ὑπο χρόνου μοῖραν πέπτωκεν)",[17] dies nicht so sehr den Sohn als den Vater in seiner Würde verletzt. Denn in der Tat gibt es den Vater nicht vor dem Sohn (ποτε) und den Sohn nicht vor dem Vater (πρίν) da der Vater immer "seine Weisheit und Kraft" bei sich hat, die Christus ist. Es wird somit versucht, ein *Gleich-sein* des Sohnes mit dem Vater gegen die Arianer zu beweisen. Damit wird auf dasjenige hingewiesen, was die griechische Vorsilbe ὁμο- auszudrücken fähig ist, ohne die notwendige Verschiedenheit des Sohnes vom Vater zu verkennen, die auch in gewissen Zeitbestimmungen des Sohnseins durchleuchtet.

b. *Verschiedenheit aufgrund des "war" und "ist"*

Des Verfassers Interesse orientiert sich im folgenden zwar an der Notwendigkeit der analogen Gotteserkenntnis.[18] Aber wenn er daran erinnert, dass der Sohn das Bild des Vaters widerspiegelt und darauf besteht, dass

---

[14] GNO III/1, 72, 5-6. Cf. 72, 5; 72, 6; 72, 23; 74, 4; 74, 6; 76, 4.

[15] GNO III/1, 72, 8-11. Daniélou führt dies als einen Beweis für eine origenistische Haltung an, sie ist aber bei Gregor auch häufig anzutreffen. Das eindrucksvollste Beispiel bietet ohne Zweifel Gregors Weihnachtspredigt *Diem natalem*.

[16] GNO III/1, 72, 11ss.

[17] GNO III/1, 72, 24.

[18] GNO III/1, 73, 5ss.

Gott selbst seine Offenbarung nach dem Gehör des Menschen bemisst (συμμετρεῖ),[19] da Gott in seiner Grösse und Kraft unmessbar ist, sich jedoch durch seine Erniedrigung (*Phil 2, 7*) unserer menschlichen Sprache angepasst hat,[20] kommt der Verfasser auf die Bedeutung der Menschwerdung zu sprechen, nach Art des Origenes. Denn nur so ist es hier möglich mit einer Beweisführung fortzufahren, die es verhütet, in einen platten Rationalismus nach Art des Eunomius zu verfallen.

Die "Niedrigkeit der Knechtsgestalt" und die Johannesstelle "Wer mich sieht, sieht den Vater", auf die im folgenden Bezug genommen wird, lassen jedoch eine antisabellianische Spitze der Beweisführung erkennen, die sich über das Gesagte hinaus bestätigt, wenn der Verfasser zusammenfassend sagt: "So glauben wir, dass Gott, nicht ein Mensch, als Mensch erschien, der von Natur aus Gott *war* und *ist*, der seine Grösse durch keinen Körper umschrieben hat".[21] So wird die Verschiedenheit des menschgewordenen Sohnes bezüglich des Vaters im *Gott-gleichsein* des erniedrigten Menschensohnes durch eine "zeitliche" Bestimmung unterstrichen, deren "ewige" Bedeutung sofort einleuchtet, wenn analog gedacht (ἀναλόγως)[22] das *Heute* in Betracht gezogen wird.[23]

c. *Das Heute*

Eine direkte Bezugnahme auf das *Heute* erwächst aus den Zeugnissen der Schrift (*Psalm* 109, 3 und *Sprüche* 8, 25): ". . . vor dem Sonnenaufgang habe ich dich gezeugt", so dass festgestellt werden kann, dass gemäss der Schrift der Sohn ἄναρχος ist.[24] Diese Feststellung wird dann erhärtet an den Beispielen der Sonne, deren Strahl nicht vor der Sonne existiert,[25] sondern ihr gleichzeitig (ἅμα) ist, der Substanz und Natur gemäss, so wie es auch

---

[19] GNO III/1, 73, 9; 12.

[20] GNO III/1, 73, 14-15: ἐκένωσε γὰρ ἑαυτὸν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι θεάσασθαι θεόν.

[21] GNO III/1, 73, 15-20.

[22] GNO III/1, 73, 25.

[23] Cf. M. Canévet, o. c., 46. n. 53.

[24] GNO III/1, 74, 2. Ein Lieblingstext der Arianer, sehr wenig von den Kappadokiern verwendet. Die von M. Simonetti erbrachten Beweise bezüglich der patristischen Auslege dieses Verses, versucht M. van Parys, Exégèse et théologie trinitaire. Prov. 8, 22 chez les Pères Cappadociens, *Irenikon* 43 (1970) fortzusetzen, um schliessen zu können, dass der Autor von *Ar et Sab* eine Exegese anbietet, die sich von derjenigen der Kappadokier bedeutend unterscheidet. Cf. M. Canévet, o. c., 268-73.

[25] Cf. Hb 1,3.

das Licht beweist, das nicht vor und nach der Laterne erscheint, sondern gleichzeitig (ἅμα).[26] Somit wird gezeigt, dass Gott nicht *nach* seiner Weisheit, sondern gleichzeitig mit ihr (ἅμα) existieren muss.[27]

Christus ist Gottes Weisheit als *"gleichzeitig"* von Gott gezeugt, wie die Schrift sagt: "heute ist sie gezeugt".[28] Für dieses "heute" (σήμερον) lässt der biblische Text jedoch keine zeitlichen Bedingungen zu (ὑπὸ χρόνου).[29] Der Verfasser besteht deshalb positiv auf einer gefüllten Gegenwart dieses Begriffes, fügt aber dennoch bei, dass, wenn man auch auf "das Ende der Welt" schliessen könnte und zugeben müsste, dass *heute* Gottes Sohn allgemeiner Richter der Lebendigen und Toten ist, und mit dem Vater zusammen herrschen wird. Demnach muss es sich hier um etwas Erhabeneres handeln als um eine chronologische Sequenz.

d. *Der Ursprung als ὁμόχρονος*

Wenn der Verfasser im folgenden die Bedeutung des Geschaffenseins der Weisheit am "Anfang Seiner Wege", (ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν) auslegt, Sprüche 8, 24,[30] besteht er darauf, dass was im Hebräischen einen präzisen Sinn hat, sich im Griechischen in Geschöpf (ἔκτισε) wandelt.[31] Das aber erlaubt nicht den Schluss zu ziehen, dass "der Vater einen Anfang seiner Wege hat" als wenn es ein *vorher* in Gott gäbe. Denn alles ist durch den πρωτότοκος geschaffen,[32] so dass die ἀρχή hier nicht als "Anfang" im zeitlichen Sinn, sondern als Herrschaft, Prinzip gedeutet werden muss, wie der Verfasser ausdrücklich feststellt und im folgenden einen Unterschied andeutet zwischen Christus und Herr bezüglich der Übergabe der Macht an den Vater.

Der Sohn existiert nämlich von Ewigkeit her beim Vater, ohne Anfang, weil der Vater von Ewigkeit her existiert, aber der Sohn ist gezeugt. Deshalb gibt es in Gott nur einen einzigen Ursprung ohne Anfang (ἄναρχος), weil

---

[26] GNO III/1, 74, 9-15.

[27] GNO III/1, 74, 15-18.

[28] GNO III/1, 74, 21-22. Für Psal 2, 7 Cf. Greg. Nyss. *Apol.* 225, 25; *Eccl.* 2 (299, 14); *Eun.* 73, 2, 40 (65, 13); *InscPs.* 3, 8 (92, 20).

[29] GNO III/1, 74, 18 Im Sinne eines Paradoxes des natürlichen *heute*, das wenn immer im Kommen zugleich bereits vergangen ist.

[30] Prov 8, 22: 74, 30; 75, 4; 75, 22.

[31] Die eigenartige Auslegung des Verfasser erklärt Daniélou als einer frühen Schaffenperiode Gregors zugehörig, die als kosmologisch seinsmässige auf Basil zurückkehren soll, während der Nyssener in *De Fide.* und *Eun.* eine ökonomische Auslegung anbietet, die aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach von Athanasius beeinflusst ist. Cf. M. Canévet, o. c., 270.

[32] GNO III/1, 80, 26.

der Sohn von Ewigkeit her beim Vater ist als gezeugter (γεννητός). Er ist vom Vater verursacht (αἴτιον) auf ähnliche Weise wie der Lichstrahl,[33] der gleichzeitig (ὁμόχρονος) vom Licht verursacht, nicht vorher, sondern jetzt ist (ἕως ἄρτι) was wiederum nicht als ἀφ' οὗ zu deuten ist, da ἀφ' οὗ Zeit beinhaltet. Es gilt vielmehr auf das hinzuweisen, was Jesus zu verstehen gibt, wenn er darauf besteht, dass er fortwährend mit dem Vater schafft.[34]

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, dass der Gebrauch des ὁμόχρονος, verbunden mit der Methapher des Lichtes, es ermöglicht, eine Gleichzeitigkeit des Ursprungs des Sohnes im Vater zu ersehen, die sowohl Gleichheit der Natur (οὐσία) als Verschiedenheit des *Sohn-Seins* aussagt (ὑπόστασις), so wie der Verfasser es dann auch mit den nachfolgenden Erklärungen zu erhärten sucht.

3. *Wesensgleichheit im Unterschied der Personen*

Die Beweisführung geht jetzt von neuem ausdrücklich auf die Lehre des Arius und Sabellius ein, indem sie sich zunächst zu verschiedenen Bibeltexten äussert, die dann im einzeln ausgelegt werden. Von den Stellen, die für die Arianer in Frage kommen, werden drei zitiert: Joh 14, 9 "der Vater ist grösser als ich", Mt 10, 18, "nur einer ist gut"[35] und Mt 24, 36 "der Sohn kennt nicht die Stunde, sondern nur der Vater".[36] Bei den Texten, die die Sabellianer mit Vorliebe zur Verteidigung ihrer Lehre benutzten, werden wiederum drei hervorgehoben: Joh 10, 30: "Ich und der Vater sind eins", Joh 14,9 "Wer mich sieht, sieht den Vater" und 1 Kor 15, 24 "Der Sohn übergibt das Reich dem Vater".[37] Der Verfasser untersucht zwar alle diese Texte schrittweise, geht aber in umgekehrter Reihenfolge vor, das heisst, er beginnt seine Ausseinandersetzung mit dem sabellianischen Verständis von 1 Kor 15, 24 was das *Sohn-Sein auf Zeit* anbetrifft, um dann auf die arianische Lehre des *naturhaften Unterschiedes des Sohnes bezüglich des Vaters* zurückzukommen.

---

[33] GNO III/1, 76, 5. M. O. Boulnois, *Le Paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique* (Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité, 143) (Paris 1994) 121, 122.

[34] GNO III/1, 76, 10-17.

[35] Cf.GNO III/1 76, 22; 82, 11.

[36] Cf. GNO III/1 84, 30; 85, 5. Mc 13, 32: GNO III/1 76, 24.

[37] Cf. GNO III/1 72, 12; 77, 1; 77, 26; 78, 8; 79, 8.

a. *Widerlegung des sabellianischen Sohn-Seins auf Zeit*

Dem Verfasser gemäss versteht Sabellius den Text "Er übergibt euch das Reich Gottes von seiten des Vaters" als einen zeitlichen Ausgang des Sohnes vom Vater, was bedeutet, dass der Sohn nach seinem Ausgang in der Zeit zum Anfang zurückkehrt und sich von neuem mit dem Vater vermischt. Nach kurzer Zurückweisung dieser Meinung mit Hilfe des "über alles erhabenen Namens" (Eph 1, 19.20) und die Berücksichtigung des dem Sohn vom Vater übertragenen Gerichtes (Joh 5, 22.23; 2 Ts 1.7.8) bemüht sich der Verfasser zu beweisen, dass der Sohn nach 1 Kor 15, 24 nicht *Sohn auf Zeit* sein kann (πρόσκαιρον).[38] Konkret fragt er nach dem Sinn der Behauptung, dass "ihm vom Vater das Gericht übergeben wird", und wendet sich direkt an seinen Interlokutor als eine Person der Liebe erwiesen wurde, die die Wahrheit erforscht und deshalb weiss, dass die Schrift sich nicht widerspricht, sondern alles in ihr "zusammenläuft" (συνῳδόν) und "zusammentönt" (σύμφωνον). wenn es heisst: "dann wird er Ihm sich selbst unterwerfen, der sich alles unterworfen hat" und "dann wird er Gott dem Vater das Reich übergeben".[39]

Im Lichte dieser "Norm für das richtige Verständnis" des Problems unterstreicht der Verfasser folgende Fragen: "Hat der Sohn sich nicht in allem dem Menschengeschlecht ähnlich gemacht (ὡμοίωτο)[40] und gelitten, wie der Prophet Isaias 53, 3 sagt?[41] Hat er nicht das Fleisch, das des Bösen fähig ist, angenommen und ist er nicht für uns zur Sünde (2 Kor 5, 21) und als Sünder betrachtet worden (Gal 3, 13)? Hat er nicht aus Mitleid unsern Namen angenommen? Hat er nicht alle in sich aufgenommen, wenn er sich dem Menschengeschlecht ähnlich gemacht und die Gestalt des Knechtes angenommen hat? Hat er sich nicht freiwillig zu gunsten des Menschengeschlechtes dem Vater angeboten, um Ihn zu besänftigen und zum Mitleid zu bewegen?[42]

Diese Fragen werden dann klar und einfach beantwortet, wenn im folgenden ausgeführt wird: "Alles ist dem Sohn unterworfen, weil er sich alles unterworfen hat". Denn wenn wir Christus gehören, Christus aber Gottes ist, sind wir dem Vater unterworfen, damit "Gott alles in allem ist". Bevor dies jedoch geschieht, ist dem Vater noch nicht alles unterworfen, da das Menschengeschlecht, das ja Bild des Sohnes ist, noch nicht in allem unter-

[38] GNO III/1, 77, 4; 14.
[39] GNO III/1, 78, 6.
[40] GNO III/1, 78, 9.18.
[41] GNO III/1 78, 10; 79, 2 Cf. M. Canévet, o. c., 137.
[42] GNO III/1, 78, 10-21.

worfen ist. Wenn aber alle unterworfen sind, wird dem Vater das Reich übergeben.[43]

Dieses Reich aber darf nicht als "Würde eines Zepters" verstanden werden, die dem Vater an königlicher Würde abginge, so dass er sie vom Sohn empfangen müsste, als wenn die Herrschaft ihm *vorher* zum Gebrauch übergeben und ihm *dann* wieder genommen würde. Eine solche Ansicht würde die Hypostase des Sohnes zerstören, wenn ihm so die Herrschaft abgesprochen würde. Im Falle jedoch, dass der Vater dem Sohn das Reich übergibt und es nachher von ihm zurückempfängt, entbehrt dieser der Würde.[44]

Deshalb wird nun darauf bestanden, dass der Sohn nicht das Reich, sondern die *beherrschten Menschen* übergibt, die ihm unterworfen sind. Dieses wird näher mit vielsagenden Texten erklärt, wie 2 Petr, 1 Kor, Hb, die "vom heiligen Volk königlicher Würde", dem "Priestertum" und "der errungenen Erbschaft" sprechen. Es geht hier einfach um diese *meine Söhne, die Gott mir gegeben hat aus allen Völkern*. So schliesst die Erklärung in folgender Weise: der Vater übergibt die Herrschaft dem Sohne nicht, weil dieser der Würde entbehrt, sondern damit er über die Menschen herrsche. Auf diese Weise wird jene unleugbare Einheit in der Verschiedenheit zwischen Vater und Sohn sichtbar, die dann weiter ausgebaut wird.

b. *Bestätigung der verschiedenen göttlichen Hypostasen in ihrer Wesenseinheit*

Der Verfasser wendet sich kurz dem entscheidenden Johannestext "Ich und der Vater sind eins" zu und besteht darauf, dass dieser Text die Hypostase des Sohnes nicht zerstört, da das Wesen des Vaters und des Sohnes eins ist, nicht aber ihre Hypostase.[45] Der Apostel gibt klar zu verstehen, dass die Vokabel Hypostase auf jede Hypostase angewendet wird, als die des Sohnes verschieden von der des Vater, wie aus dem Paulustext hervorgeht, "einer sät, einer erntet", und jeder einzelne (ἴδιον) verdient seinen Lohn. Die Vokabel "eins" (ἕν) darf also nicht so verstanden werden, dass sie die Hypostase zerstört, fasst der Verfasser zusammen, um dann näher auf den Hervorgang dieser Hypostase des Sohnes einzugehen.

---

[43] GNO III/1, 79, 5.
[44] GNO III/1, 79, 15-25.
[45] GNO III/1, 79, 26-80, 22.

c. *Erweis der Gleichzeitigkeit des Hervorganges des Sohnes aus dem Vater*

Wenn die Beweisführung sich nun wiederum den arianischen Gegnern zuwendet,[46] wird ihnen vorgeworfen, dass sie sobald sie ihrerseits den Sohn als Geschöpf (ποίημα, eine fremde Substanz) verstehen, ihn zum Instrument erniedrigen.[47] Deshalb wird direkt gefragt: Habt ihr nicht genug Beweise dafür, dass der Sohn vom Vater gezeugt und selbst Weisheit und Tugend genannt wird, und dass es sich hier um Gaben der Seele (ἀρεταὶ δὲ ψυχῆς) und Früchte des Geistes (ἀποφοραὶ νοῦ) handelt,[48] grundgelegt in der Wurzel der Weisheit. Wenn diese als zu bestimmter Zeit (ἡ σοφία ἔν τινι χρόνῳ)[49] geschaffen betrachtet werden, wären sie Geschöpfe von anderer Art als der Sohn, ohne den nichts geschaffen ist. Wenn aber anderseits der Sohn als Adoptivsohn betrachtet wird, muss man zugeben, dass wenn die Weisheit ἔν τινι χρόνῳ geschaffen wurde, muss es eine andere ältere (ἑτέρα . . . πρεσβυτέρα) Weisheit geben, durch welche die zweite (δευτέρα) geschaffen ist.

In Wirklichkeit ist es aber so, dass die Weisheit immer beim Vater ist – und alles durch den πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως geschaffen wird als zeitlose Ursache aller Geschöpfe von Anfang an.[50] Sodann fährt der Verfasser fort, deshalb wird der Sohn auch mit der Vokabel *Wort* benannt, um zu beweisen, dass er gezeugt ist (γεννητός), nicht geschaffen. Das Wort wird nämlich *gezeugt* (τίκτεται) aber nicht *geschaffen* (κτίζεται): es geht durch den Mund hervor (προφερόμενος), sobald es im Herzen erwacht (κινούμενος).[51] Deshalb sagt der Vater: "Aus meinen Herzen steigt ein gutes Wort auf" (Psal 44, 2) und der Sohn bekennt zusammen mit Ihm (συνομολογεῖ) "Ich bin aus dem Mund des Allerhöchsten hervorgegangen".[52] Wer wagt es da noch, den Sohn für ein Geschöpf zu halten? wird zusammenfassend gefragt.[53] Der Sohn kann folglich nicht ungezeugt sein, sondern lebt als vom Vater gezeugt und, mehr noch, Ihm immer zugewandt,[54] wie es das πρός zu verstehen gibt, das seit dem *Johannesprolog* in diesem Sinne verstanden wird.

---

[46] GNO III/1, 80, 8s.
[47] GNO III/1, 80, 12.
[48] GNO III/1, 80, 16.
[49] GNO III/1, 80, 18.
[50] GNO III/1, 80, 25-26.
[51] GNO III/1, 80, 29.
[52] Cf. Psal 44,2 (45, 2); GNO III/1 71, 1; 71, 2; 80, 30.
[53] GNO III/1, 80, 30-81, 3.
[54] GNO III/1, 80, 25-26: παρὰ τῷ πατρί.

d. *Das πρός Ausdruck eines dem Vater-immer-zugewandtes Sein*

Wenn der Verfasser seine Aufmerksamkeit nun auf das ἦν im Johannestext 1,1 lenkt,[55] hebt er hervor, dass es sich um ein *imperfectum* handelt. Damit unterstreicht er den Wert der *Zeit* als Fortdauer, die an *Ewigkeit* erinnert: von Ewigkeit her hat Gott einen Sohn (Jn 1, 1): "Im Anfang war das Wort", ohne dass sich ein menschlicher Geist diesen Ursprung aus Gott genau vorstellen kann. Dasselbe gilt vom: wenn das Wort dem Vater wesensgleich (ὁμοούσιος) erklärt wird,[56] dürfen wir nicht glauben, dass er geboren ist, oder *vor* dem Vater existierte; denn das Wort πρός artikultiert eine eigene Hypostase, da Johannes erklärt "Im Anfang war das Wort und das Wort war bei Gott" (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). Dieses deutet auf eine eigene Hypostase (ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν), die als Wort aus der Substanz des Vaters (ἐκ πατρικῆς οὐσίας) ist.[57] Deshalb existiert Gott in Gott und hat keinen Ursprung (Θεὸς δὲ ὅτι ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι).[58] Der Verfasser erinnert dann noch kurz daran, dass "nicht nur wir dies behaupten, sondern auch die Philosophie".[59]

Wie zu ersehen ist, wird hier ein Verständnis des *ὁμο-ούσιος* ersichtlich, dass die *Gleichzeitigkeit* von *Gott-* und *Sohn-sein* derart untermauert, dass eine falsche Zeitdimension für dieses *Sohn-sein* von vornherein ausgeschlossen, aber die grundlegende Wahrheit derselben bewahrt und ans Licht gezogen wird, so dass das Zueinander der göttlichen Personen, vornehmlich in Seinskategorien artikuliert, nun auf seine innere Dynamik als *Eintracht* hinterfragt werden muss.

4. *Die Eintracht der göttlichen Personen im gegenseitigen Durchdringen*

Bevor der Verfasser die ausdrückliche Widerlegung der Gegner mit einer Auslegung von Joh 10, 30 abschliesst, kommt er auf einen besonders schwierigen Johannestext zu sprechen, der "den Vater für grösser als der Sohn" erklärt (14, 28),[60] fügt aber seiner Beweisführung noch einen Abschnitt bei, dessen Dichte aus der Bedeutung der *Perichorese* erwächst, die mit dem relativ häufigen Gebrauch der Vokabel περιέχω und ihrer Zusammensetzungen

[55] GNO III/1, 81, 4ss.
[56] GNO III/1, 81, 10-11.
[57] GNO III/1, 81, 18.
[58] GNO III/1, 81, 22-23.
[59] GNO III/1, 81, 24-25.
[60] GNO III/1, 81, 26-82, 26.

verbunden ist.[61] Dadurch wird das wesenhafte Zueinander des Sohnes zum Vater als ein dynamisches *Ineinander* der göttlichen Personen erwiesen, das von ihrer grösstmöglichen Verschiedenheit her zu denken ist, wie es durch eine Bezugnahme auf die ausschlagebende Haltung der Demut des Heilandes dargestellt wird.

a. *Demütige Gesinnung und göttliche Grösse*

Zunächst wird die Sabellianische Lehre, der Vater sei der Menschgewordene, scharf zurück gewiesen, um dann die Bedeutung des Satzes, dass "der Vater grösser ist als ich" (Joh 14, 28) als Demut (ταπεινοφροσύνη) des menschgewordenen Sohnes zu verstehen, der auf diese Weise seine göttliche Grösse offenbart.[62] Als Begründung dieser Haltung wird auf ein aktmässiges Bezogensein auf den Andern, wie Sprüche 27, 2 es zu verstehen gibt, hingewiesen: "Es lobe dich der Nächste und nicht dein eigener Mund". Darüber hinaus geht es dem Verfasser aber um die letzte innergöttliche Wahrheit, durch die der Sohn die Ursache seiner Existenz im Vater anerkennt, weshalb er dann fragt: "wenn Gott nicht existiert, wie dann Seine Weisheit?[63] oder wenn der Vater nicht ist, wie dann der Sohn"?[64]

Der Sohn offenbart also mit seiner Demut zugleich (ἅμα) seine göttliche Grösse. Ähnliches gibt der folgende Text Mk 10, 18 zu verstehen, der in dieselbe Richtung weist: Der Erlöser antwortet nämlich dem Jüngling, der ihn gut nennt, dass "nur einer gut ist, Gott".[65] Daraus wird sinnvoll gefolgert, dass Christus sagen will, "Ich bin ein Mensch, ihr nennt mich gut, denn nur einer ist gut", so dass klar wird, dass "er und der Vater eins sind". Jedoch wird beigefügt, dass dies "auf geheimnisvolle Weise" (μυστικῶς) zu verstehen ist und festgestellt, dass Christus sich, der Wahrheit entsprechend, als an der väterlichen Güte (τῷ Πατρὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος) teilhabend (συμμέτοχον) versteht.[66] Daraus ergibt sich die Bedeutung der Worte "Ich und der Vater sind eins": Christus ist dem Vater gleich, als vollkommener Sohn aus dem vollkommenen Vater existiert er in jener göttlichen Perichorese, die sein Anderssein bestätigt.[67]

---

[61] GNO III/1, 82, 26-84, 3.
[62] GNO III/1, 82, 1.
[63] 1 Kor 1, 24: GNO III/1 72, 19; 73, 3; 74, 17; 75, 19; 80, 14; 82, 8.
[64] GNO III/1, 82, 2-8.
[65] GNO III/1, 82, 9.18.
[66] GNO III/1, 82, 18-22.
[67] GNO III/1, 82, 18-25.

b. *Perichorese und Anderssein*

Der Verfasser stellt nun eine bedeutsame Frage: wenn der Vater vollkommen ist und alles einschliesst, was bleibt dem vollkommenen Sohn? Was umfasst er? Seine Antwort ist folgende: "beide, Vater und Sohn, umschliessen sich gleichzeitig (δεκτικοὺς καὶ χωρητικούς). "Ich bin im Vater und der Vater ist in mir". Wenn beide sich aber gegenseitig so umschliessen, sind sie einander an Grösse gleich. Menschlich gesprochen, fügt die lateinische Übersetzung bei, was das griechische Original nicht erwähnt, ergibt sich für dieses *gegenseitige Enthalten*. Ein Überschuss, der Leere bedeutet, da wir Menschen uns ja niemals vollständig einander kennen können, wenn wir von einem zum andern *hinübersteigen*. Deshalb ist die Erfahrung der Leere für uns unvermeidlich. Von Gott aber müssen wir anders denken, stellt der Verfasser fest.[68] Er veranschaulicht eine göttliche Eintracht oder Einmütigkeit innerhalb der Verschiedenheit der Personen, die mit menschlichen Begriffen allein nicht erfassbar ist, wohl aber anhand von eindrucksvollen Bildern.[69]

c. *Eintracht in der Verschiedenheit*

Ein erstes Beispiel, dessen der Verfasser sich hier bedient, stammt aus dem Seelenleben, wenn von der Eigenart der Seele im Menschen gesprochen wird, in der zwei Wissenschaften gleichzeitig (ἅμα) sein können, z. B. Philosophie und Medizin, ohne dass aber die Seele als solche belästigt wird. Im Gegenteil, beide Wisssenschaften ergänzen sich gegenseitig. Daraus wird geschlossen, dass dasselbe in bezug auf Gott gilt: der Vater und der Sohn befinden sich gleichzeitig am selben Platz und beinhalten einander, sind eins als zwei, das heisst, sie durchdringen sich gegenseitig in der Substanz, sind als Personen jedoch verschieden von einander.[70]

Der Verfasser führt dann noch zwei weitere Bilder an: zunächst spricht er vom Duft des Salböls, der sich durch die Luft hin ausbreitet, ohne sich mit dieser zu identifizieren, so dass es am selben Ort zugleich Duft und Luft gibt. Obwohl beide ineinander fliessen, bleiben sie verschieden. Dasselbe gilt dann vom Sonnenlicht: Licht und Sonne bedingen sich derart gegenseitig, dass sie unmöglich getrennt existieren können, sich aber auch nicht vollständig miteinander identifizieren. So ist es mit der Gottheit: als Vater und Sohn sind sie völlig eins in ihrer Grösse und Gesinnung, befinden sich

[68] GNO III/1, 83, 9.
[69] GNO III/1, 83, 10-84, 3.
[70] GNO III/1, 83, 10-23.

also in voller Eintracht, was Substanz (οὐσία) und Willen (ὁμοφροσύνη) anbetrifft, sind aber verschieden als Hypostase und Namen.[71]

Auf diese Weise mündet die Beweisführung in ein *Gleich-sein* Gottes ein, das vom gemeinsamen Sinnen und Trachten (ὁμοφροσύνη) vollständig geprägt, aber keinen zeitlichen Abstand in der Durchdringung ihrer göttlichen Personen zulässt. Trotzdem scheint diese Durchdringung die kreatürliche Existenz in der Zeit als solche zu begründen. Um diese Existenz, sowohl um ihre Schattenseiten als auch um ihre lichte Grundfassung geht es dann dem Verfasser, wenn er im folgenden auf offene Fragen eingeht, die zunächst als einfacher Anhang erscheinen, sich dann aber als *das* Problem der Zeit und des in ihr schlummernden Geheimnisses der Gleichzeitigkeit erweisen könnten, wenn man seine einzigartige Beziehung auf den Heiligen Geist in Betracht zieht.

5. *Des Verfassers offene Fragen und der Heilige Geist*

Wenn der Verfasser am Schluss seiner Abhandlung darauf hinweist, dass der Vater alles erfüllt und für den Sohn das Gleiche gilt, stellt er eine recht dornige Frage: "Bleibt noch Platz für feindliche Gewalten?" Somit taucht das Problem des Bösen auf, das sicherlich eine Aporie darstellen könnte, aber dennoch aus dem vorher Gesagten in etwa zu verstehen ist.

a. *Das Problem des Bösen*

Es wird behauptet, dass Gott sicher nicht mit sich selbst in Widerspruch geraten kann. Aber da sich "der Fürst der Bosheit" (ὁ τῆς κακίας ἄρχων)[72] an einem Ort befinden muss, der nicht Gott sein kann, da es in Gott aber weder Ort noch Umschreibung noch Aufteilung geben kann, gibt es auch keinen Ort für das Böse. Denn es gilt, dass ähnlich wie die Sonnenstrahlen in die Finsternis dringen und diese durch ihre Hitze mächtig reinigen, unser "Gott ein verzehrendes Feuer" ist.

b. *Gott, ein verzehrende Feuer*

Wenn der Verfasser Gott als "verzehrendes Feuer" bezeichnet, macht er Gebrauch von Hb 12, 29:[73] Psal 49, 3 und bedient sich einer biblischen

---

[71] GNO III/1, 83, 23-84, 3.

[72] GNO III/1, 84, 8; 11; 18.

[73] Cf. GNO III/1, 84, 14; auch Gregor *Eun.* 3, 3, 52; *Hex.* 81.

Metapher, für die er eine besondere Vorliebe zeigt, was ihre trinitarische Bedeutung anbetrifft, die er zusammen mit der des Lichtes bereits vorher in der Erklärung der Perichorese der göttlichen Personen erwähnte. Gewiss gilt hier diesselbe Wahrheit, da sowohl das Feuer als auch das Licht ein analoges Verständnis des Ineinanderseins verschiedener Aspekte ermöglicht. Aber hier geht es nicht allein um "verschiedene" Elemente, sondern um einander "entgegengesetzte" (ἐναντίον), das heisst, feindliche Faktoren. Damit öffnet sich ein Graben, der nicht allein in der kreatürlichen Seinsweise und seiner realen Differenz zum Ungeschaffenen gründet, sondern auch als deren Umkehrung sich Geltung verschafft, und deshalb den Widerspruch zu Gott und Seinem Willen in der Gestalt des Bösen darstellt.

Der Ursprung des Bösen (hier personhaft, nicht abstrakt) wird als ein "Fliehen vor der Wärme Gottes, verstanden, die alle Menschen durchdringt", unter denen es dann aber solche gibt, die sobald ihr Geist sich erhitzt, der Wärme Gottes auszuweichen suchen.[74] Auf diese Weise glaubt der "Fürst der Bosheit", dem verzehrenden Feuer Gottes zu entkommen. Dennoch erreicht Gott auch diese Feinde, so dass Seine Flammen sie verzehren. Hiermit macht sich eine Idee bemerkbar, die Origenes ähnlich behandelt, wenn er von der Finsternis spricht, die vom Licht aufgezehrt wird und sich so in Licht verwandelt. Es wird dann noch ein Hinweis auf den Heiligen Geist hinzugefügt, der im folgenden tiefer zu ergründen ist.

c. *Der Heilige Geist*

Wenn der Verfasser das Böse erklärt, spricht er davon, dass es sich hier um jemand handelt, "der des Heiligen Geistes entbehrt" (ἔν τινι μὴ ἔχοντι Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ).[75] Daraus ist zu entnehmen, dass das Böse sich als ein Entbehren

---

[74] GNO III/1, 84, 20-23 . . . τινὰς τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντας . . . ἔν τινι μὴ ἔχοντι πνεῦμα θεοῦ σεσαρωμένην . . . Der Verfasser stellt hier zwei Ideen gegenüber, die Gregor in dem ebensfalls diskutierten Text *In suam ordinem* verbindet: "Er spielt gegen die Leugner der Gottheit des Heiligen Geistes auf Offb 3, 15 an: "Ach, dass du kalt oder warm wärest". Das Warm-sein ist gänzlich Gabe des Geistes (337, 3f) die Kälte Folge der Sünde. Damit ist, rhetorische glanzvoll, die Stellung im Streit um den Geist mit der Wirklichkeit des Geistes selbst und seinem Wirken zusammengebracht und die Antwort auf die Frage vorbereitet, warum denn einst unter den Jüngern des Herrn eine solche Menge der Kirche zugeführt worden sei, jetzt aber die Worte so vieler und glänzender Lehrer wirkungslos bleiben (p. 337, 7-10). Cf. G. Kretschmar, Die Theologie der Kappadokier und die asketischen Bewegungen in Kleinasien im 4. Jahrhundert, in P. Hauptmann (Hrg), *Unser ganzes Leben Christus unserm Herrn überantworten* (Göttingen 1982) 106.

[75] GNO III/1, 84, 22-23.

der Heiligkeit und der Teilnahme am Wesen Gottes verlustig erweist.[76] Somit taucht im Menschen jene Leere auf, die in bezug auf Gott ausdrücklich durch die vorherige Erklärung der Perichorese der göttlichen Personen verneint wurde. Aber könnte die Verneinung dieser "Leere in Gott" nicht auf die Fülle des Heiligen Geistes hindeuten?[77] In der Tat ermöglicht der Heilige Geist, sowohl für Origenes als auch für Gregor von Nyssa, das Durchdringen des Vaters und des Sohnes als ihre Differenz, weshalb der Heilige Geist besonders im Nyssener der Perichorese Konsistenz verleiht, und ausserdem auch als Fülle (πλήρωμα) bezeichnet wird.[78]

Deshalb kann es nicht überraschen, wenn die Überwindung der Leere im Menschen als "Reinigung und Ausschmückung" desjenigen verstanden wird, das sich nur "kurze Zeit" (ἐπ' ὀλίγον) dem Göttlichen und seiner Glut, das heisst, Seinem Geist, widersetzte, sich also als Feind Gottes verhielt. Dieser Feind verwandelt sich jedoch in einen Freund, sobald Gott ihm seine Freundschaft anbietet und dieser sie annimmt.

d. *Die "kurze Zeit"*

Wenn der Verfasser sich zum Schluss seiner Beweisführung auf die "Kürze der Zeit" bezieht, in der ein "aufgebrachter Geist" als Gegenmacht operiert, verwendet er eine zeitlich bedeutsame Formel: ἐπ' ὀλίγον.[79] Dieser Ausdruck kommt nicht nur relativ häufig im gregorianischen Gesamtwerk vor,[80] sondern hat auch von der Heiligen Schrift her eine Bedeutungsdichte, die sowohl negativ als auch positiv ausgewertet werden kann: zunächst erweist sich diese "Kürze" als Grundstruktur des menschlichen Daseins insofern es Geschöpf ist, dann aber bezeichnet sie auch die sündhafte Verkehrung dieses Daseins als vom Tod her bestimmtes Ende. Für den Verfasser ist hier die negative Bedeutung anzunehmen, die aber nicht in sich, sondern als Vorbereitung für den Schluss der Beweisführung ausgedeutet werden muss, wie es im letzten Abschnitt des gegenwärtigen Werkes gezeigt wird, wenn der Verfasser nochmals auf die Ungewissheit des Weltenendes zurückkommt.

---

[76] Cf. M. Canévet, Nature du mal, et économie du salut chez Grégoire de Nysse, *RSR* 56 (1968) 87-95.

[77] Cf. *Eun. Ref.* 190, 192.

[78] Cf. GNO II, 190-192.

[79] GNO III/1, 84, 23.

[80] Cf. *Mac.* GNO 3/1, 108, 13; *In illud.* GNO IX 120,18: *In sanctam pascha.* GNO IX 253, 2 (cf. 263, 10); *Ep* 1, 12. 5; 13, 4.12; *Cast.* (PG 46.312.5).

Zunächst wird hier das bereits Gesagte bezüglich der Demut Jesu wiederholt, die als überschwenglich bezeichnet wird. Das Ausschlaggebende aber ist wohl die Begründung für diese Ungewissheit, die als notwendig für jede wahre Verwirklichung des Menschseins angesehen wird. Zwei sind nämlich die wirklichen Güter für das Menschengeschlecht: das Fundament der Demut und die Ungewissheit des Endes der Welt. Der Sohn hat beides vorgelebt, deshalb, kann die äusserste Demut Jesu als Ausdruck seines wahren Menschseins verstanden werden, obwohl er ja mit dem Vater die "Stunde" hat kennen müssen.[81]

Zusammenfassend ergibt sich, dass eine Gleichzeitigkeit in der menschlichen Existenz auftaucht, deren Spannungen letztlich nur im Heiligen Geist durchgestanden werden können, da sie sich nach Art des *Nicht-direkt-gesehen* und *erfasst-werden-können* des Geistes, dem Feuer und Lichtes ähnlich, in der Demut des menschgewordenen Sohnes konkretisiert, aber dennoch auf jene Zeitspanne angewiesen ist, die der Schöpfung von ihrem Anfang her vom Vater zugemessen ist als auf ein wirkliches Ende hin zugehend.

Kritische Auswertung

Wenn es nun gilt die theologische Bedeutung der entdeckten Aspekte des ὁμόχρονος kurz zusammenzufassen und kritisch auszuwerten, ist zunächst festzustellen, dass der Verfasser die Bedeutung des ὁμο auf einer dreifachen Ebene (immer geht es um das innergöttliche Leben, das sich nach aussen verschenkt) artikuliert, die sowohl die *Gleichzeitigkeit* (ὁμόχρονος) des Ursprungs des Sohnes im Vater als auch seine *Wesensgleichheit* (ὁμοούσιος) und auch die *Einmütigkeit* (ὁμοφροσύνη) mit dem Vater in der Perichorese klar hervorhebt. Dadurch wird bewiesen, dass es sich sowohl um ein statisches *Eigensein* (ἴδιον) als auch um ein dynamisches *In und für einander-sein* (πρός) der göttlichen Personen handelt, das im Heiligen Geist seine Garantie findet als offene Differenz zwischen Vater und Sohn, eine Differenz, die keinen zeitlichen Abstand zulässt.

Der zeitliche Abstand (διάστημα) jedoch ist für das kreatürliche Sein grundlegend und bleibt als solches in Gott verankert, weshalb es sich – das ist der zweite Grundzug der gegenwärtigen Beweisführung – zwischen Anfang und Ende ausspannt, im *Heute* aber erst zur Gegenwart wird. Dieses *Heute* wird zwar vom χρόνος mitbestimmt, geht aber nicht in ihm auf. So wird

[81] Nach M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique*, 163, ist diese Auslegung nicht grundlegend für Gregor.

eine Gleichzeitigkeit offenbar, die den von der Schöpfung her empfangenen Anfang (ἀρχή) nie chronologisch hinter sich lässt, noch das durch die Menschwerdung überbotene Ende (τέλος) absolut vorwegnimmt, jedoch von jenem "Überschuss" lebt, der, natürlich erahnt, in Jesus Christus personhaft geworden ist. Deshalb wird im *Heute* jene Gegenwart erspürt, die die Zeit als solche nicht kennt, aber auf die sie immer wieder stösst, wenn sie sich gleichzeitig als Fülle und Nicht-Fülle, Gegenwart und Abstand, Verschiedenheit und Eintracht erfährt, was nur möglich ist im Heiligen Geist.

Eine solche Gleichzeitigkeit bestätigt tatsächlich der Gebrauch des ὁμόχρονος in Verbindung mit der Lichtmetapher, mit deren Hilfe Gregor von Nyssa gewöhnlich seine Aussagen über den Ursprung des Heiligen Geistes und dessen Gottheit vervollständigt, da er sie begrifflich nicht formulieren kann.[82] Hier muss sie in Kauf genommen werden, um das Verhältnis des ungeschaffenen Seins zum frei geschaffenen in der seinsmässigen Differenz richtig zu verstehen. Auf diese spielt der Verfasser nämlich an, wenn er auf die nie voll bewältigte Aufgabe der freien Existenz und den damit verbundenen fatalen Konsequenzen durch seine Frage nach dem Ort des Bösen zu sprechen kommt; damit wird eine dritte Grundlinie der Beweisführung blossgelegt.

Die theologische Bedeutung des ὁμοχρόνως wird jedoch erst voll in ihrer eigentlichen Tiefe aufgeschlüsselt, wenn dem Bösen nicht die zeitliche Ausdehnung, wohl aber der lokale Ort abgesprochen wird, und damit die Natur des "Fürsten der Bosheit" sich zu seinem sündigen Widerspruch zu Gott erklärt. Es handelt sich in der Tat um ein freies Vorgehen des Bösen, wenn er "die Glut Gottes flieht" und sich aus Neid und Eifersucht gegen sie empört, um von Gott Abstand zu nehmen, ohne dies im letzten zu können, da die "Zeit kurz ist für seine Empörung" und Gott als das wahre Licht in seine Finsternis eindringt. Wenn der Verfasser aber diese "kurze Zeit" (ἐπ' ὀλίγον) nun ausdrücklich mit einer menschlichen Existenz, die "des Geistes Gottes entbehrt", in Verbindung bringt, diese Existenz jedoch als von Gott erreicht und verwandelt beschreibt, kann es da im letzten noch um ein neutrales *Nicht-sein* oder eine *sündhafte Leere* gehen? Oder wird nicht jene Gleichzeitigkeit kurzfristig sündiger Verwirklichung des geschaffenen Menschengeistes und ewiger Gegenwart des ungeschaffenen Gottes Geistes offenbar, die nur als Paradox erfahren und erfasst werden kann?

---

[82] A. de Halleux, "Manifesté par le Fils". Aux origines d'une formule pneumatologique, *RTL* 20 (1989) 3-31.

Eine solche paradoxe Gleichzeitigkeit bezüglich einer aus Feindschaft in Freundschaft verwandelten Existenz kann sich nur mit jener Grundhaltung Jesu – hiermit erscheint ein vierter Grundaspekt der Beweisführung – verwirklichen, die besonders im Werk des Nysseners relativ häufig auftaucht, die Demut. Da nur sie und die Ungewissheit des Weltenendes, die beiden fundamentalen Güter wahren Menschseins als von Jesus vorgelebt und zur Nachfolge angeboten, garantieren, kann die paradoxe Spannung der geschöpflich-konkreten Existenz in ihrer Vielfalt nicht nur ausgehalten, sondern auch verwirklicht werden, durch die schrittweise Aneignung jener Fülle, die der Geist Gottes als Heiliger in Person ist.

Sind es nun aber nicht gerade die hier aufgezeigten Spannungen, die Jesus in seiner Existenz als *Gott-Mensch* voll durchgelebt und aus-gestanden hat, wie es der Heilige Geist, besondern nach Gregor von Nyssa, dem willigen Menschengeist *geheimnisvoll*, immer *analog* zu verstehen und verwirklichen hilft, die Arius, Sabellius und ihre Gefolgsleute gerade was ihre Gleichzeitigkeit anbetrifft zerstören? Wird es nicht nun von hier aus möglich sein, die Stellung des Verfassers zu den Irrtümern des Arius und Sabellius im *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* als eine antiorigenistische Neufassung näher zu bestimmen und zu klären? Zunächst ist klar geworden, dass wenn Gregor mit Hilfe des ὁμοχρόνως eine chronologisch verstandene Praeexistenz der Seelen im *ComCant* zurückweist und eine solche Gleichzeitigkeit sich im *ArSab* als im Heiligen Geist begründet erweist, auf Origenes zurückgegangen werden kann. Dieser weist nicht nur jede chronologische Folge in der Verbindung von Seele und Leib zurück, obwohl er sich für eine nicht-Gleichzeitigkeit entscheidet, sondern beschreibt auch die Wirklichkeit des Heiligen Geistes sowohl als Hypostase in seiner Verbindung zum Vater und Sohn, als auch in der Heiligung der Menschen (*PArch* I 3), genau wie der Verfasser sie klarstellt.

Um diese innere Verbindung der Autoren jedoch für ein letztes Verständnis einer antiorigenistischen Beweisführung im *Ar et Sab* voll auswerten zu können, genügt es nicht, nur die hier festgestellten chronologischen Verschiebungen der gegnerischen Lehre in Betracht zu ziehen. Es muss vielmehr an das "geistliche Verständnis" der protologischen Wahrheiten erinnert werden, das sowohl für Origenes als auch für Gregor grundlegend ist, wenn sie darauf bestehen, dass der literarische Sinn des Bibeltextes "im Heiligen Geist" zur vollen Wahrheit hin überschritten werden muss.

Ergibt sich daraus aber nicht, dass weder der einfache Mythos noch seine "chronologische Verzerrung", wie sie die origenistischen Strömungen des IV Jahrhunderts ins Spiel zu bringen scheinen, die tiefen Spannungen der menschlichen Existenz, die sich ihrem innergöttlichen Paradigma gemäss,

in der Verbindung von Leib und Geist zusammenfassen lassen, auszustehen befähigen, sondern diese gerade in ihrer Wurzel ausglätten wollen sowohl durch kohärente Systeme als auch durch eine übertriebene Begeisterung? In der Tat scheinen diese Strömungen ihre notwendigen Angelpunkte sowohl in der arianischen als auch in der sabellianischen Lehre gefunden zu haben, weshalb das unscheinbare Wörtchen ὁμόχρονος, jene Verschiebungen ans Licht zu ziehen vermag, die zu Recht einer Verurteilung des Lehramtes verfallen sind. Gregor von Nyssa hat diese Verschiebungen entschieden zurückgewiesen, wie es sein adverbialer Gebrauch des ὁμοχρόνως beweist, kann aber ihre Widerlegung erst aus dem Kontext des Konzils von Konstantinopel aus Treue zu Origenes voll durchführen, wie es sich aus der Beweisführung und der Nähe zum Verfasser des *Ar et Sab* ersehen lässt.

Facultad de Teología
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

LA LÉGENDE D'EUDOXIE ET DU SAINT SÉPULCRE DANS UN PAPYRUS COPTE DE BERLIN

PAR

ENZO LUCCHESI

Sous le N° 385 de ses *Koptische Urkunden*[1], le Prof. Helmut Satzinger, bien connu des égyptologues, a publié avec un essai de traduction allemande six fragments littéraires sur papyrus, provenant du même codex, conservés aux Staatliche Museen de Berlin sous le numéro d'inventaire P. 22157. L'auteur décrit le contenu de ces fragments (*a-f*) comme suit:

> ... Die Zusammengehörigkeit aller Fragmente ist keineswegs erwiesen, sie wird nur auf Grund des materials und der Schrift vermutet (dasselbe gilt von einer Anzahl weiterer Fragmente derselben Inventarnummer, die hier nicht mitgeteilt werden) ...
>
> Vom Inhalt ist nicht viel zu erkennen. Die Geschichte scheint in christlicher Zeit in Palästina zu spielen. Fragment b erwähnt Jerusalem, Fragment a Juden der Stämme Juda und Benjamin als Steinbruch-Arbeiter und Lastträger(?), die getauft werden. Die Hauptperson scheint „das junge Mädchen" zu sein (Fragment a...), wohl identisch mit der „Jungfrau" (Fragmente a, b), sowie „die Frau des Königs" (Fragmente a, b). Fragment f erwähnt wohl einen „heiligen *Apa Th*...".

Si M. Satzinger a eu bien raison de douter de l'appartenance de tous les fragments à la même pièce, pour les fragments *a* et *b* (et éventuellement *f*, où il serait question d'un apa Th[éophile]), leur identification lui était pour ainsi dire servie sur un plateau d'argent par un papyrus de Turin, où la *Légende d'Eudoxie et du saint sépulcre*, à laquelle se rattachent à coup sûr ces fragments de Berlin, se lit in extenso, d'autant plus que l'édition du *Taurinensis* était disponible depuis la fin du XIXe siècle[2]. Or, si cela peut

[1] III. Band, 2. Heft, Berlin, 1968, p. 105-109, cf. pl. VIa.

[2] Fr. Rossi, *Trascrizione di tre manoscritti copti del Museo Egizio di Torino con traduzione italiana*, in *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, sér. II, Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, t. 37 (1886), p. 84-115 + 173-174 (texte) et 150-162 + 174-175 (trad.), cf. introd., p. 66 (correspondances textuelles avec le papyrus de Berlin de p. 113, col. III, l. 7, à p. 115, col. III, l. 2).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

consoler M. Satzinger, la toute récente réédition de ce dernier papyrus par Tito Orlandi[3] ignore tout autant le *Berolinensis*.

Le verso du fragment *b* qui, malgré la perte de quelques lignes d'écriture, se raccorde au fragment *a*, dont il forme la partie inférieure de la colonne ainsi reconstituée grosso modo, le verso, dis-je, coïncide, comme il ressort aussi des motifs décoratifs, avec le *desinit* de la pièce, à laquelle sont par contre étrangers les fragments *c-e*. Il se pourrait par ailleurs que dans le «Anzahl weiterer Fragmente derselben Inventarnummer, die hier nicht mitgeteilt werden», il y en ait qui appartiennent à la colonne manquante de ce folio en particulier, ou à la *Légende d'Eudoxie* en général.

Puisque nous sommes en veine d'identifications, non moins évidente était l'appartenance des fragments *c*, *d* et *e* du N° 381 précédent (p. 95-98) au *Martyre d'Apollonius et de Philémon* (*BHG* 1514; *BHO* 973), comme l'a bien vu, dans son compte rendu du volume cité de Satzinger[4], Michel van Esbroeck, qui a eu le mérite de rétablir l'ordre de deux fragments (C^r D^r C^v D^v), sans toutefois mentionner le recoupement textuel avec un autre papyrus de Turin, également édité jadis par Rossi[5].

À la lumière du texte parallèle, le fragment *c*, qui s'avère maintenant être le haut de la colonne extérieure, et le fragment *e*, qui constitue le bas (marge comprise) de la colonne intérieure, se soudent parfaitement au frag-

---

[3] *Eudoxia and the Holy Sepulchre. A Constantinian Legend in Coptic.* Edited by Tito ORLANDI. Introduction and Translation by Birger A. PEARSON. Historical Study by Harold A. DRAKE, Milan, 1980, cf. pl. I-II (correspondances textuelles avec le papyrus de Berlin de p. 78, l. 28, à p. 82, l. 1). Ce qui porte à trois le nombre des témoins connus jusqu'ici, en incluant bien entendu le fragment de Manchester (*ibid.*, p. 26-27, cf. pl. III-IV).

[4] In *Analecta Bollandiana*, 89 (1971), p. 214-215. Pour le N° 385 aussi, M. VAN ESBROECK a fait preuve de perspicacité et était à deux doigts de l'identification, ayant subodoré «une histoire où il s'agit d'une reine, d'une conversion des juifs et de l'Anastasis à Jérusalem; des traits parallèles se rencontrent dans la légende syriaque de l'Invention de la Croix (*BHO* 211 et même *BHO* 216): conversion des Juifs, construction de l'Anastasis».

[5] *Un nuovo codice copto del Museo Egizio di Torino contenente la vita di s. Epifanio ed i martiri di s. Pantoleone, di Ascla, di Apollonio, di Filemone, di Ariano e di Dios con versetti di vari capitoli del «Libro di Giobbe»*, in *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, sér. V, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, t. I (1893), p. 69-77 (texte) et 123-127 (trad.), cf. introd., p. 5. Le parallèle court de la p. 71, col. II, l. 19, à la p. 72, col. II, l. 6. Par ses publications imparfaites même pour son époque, Rossi n'en continue pas moins de rendre service, surtout à ceux qui comme nous ont été privés d'accès aux papyrus de Turin.— Sur Philémon et Apollonius, dont la plus ancienne notice figure au ch. XIX de l'*Historia monachorum* (éd. FESTUGIÈRE, p. 115-118), voir notamment Th. BAUMEISTER, *Der Märtyrer Philemon*, in *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*, hrsg. von E. DASSMANN und K. S. FRANK, Münster Westf., 1980, p. 267-279.

ment *d*, dont la colonne intérieure est réduite à quelques lettres, pour ne former ensemble qu'un seul et unique feuillet, au demeurant toujours incomplet mais que, là encore, viendront peut-être compléter les «weitere, hier nicht mitgeteilte Fragmente» dont parle Satzinger (p. 95).

Naturellement, comme pour le N° 385, plusieurs lectures et interprétations fautives de Satzinger sont à rectifier à l'aide du témoin turinois complet, et nous laisserons à l'intéressé, qui a travaillé sur les originaux, le soin de procéder à la reconstitution des fragments berlinois.

Turin vient donc une fois de plus à la rescousse de Berlin.

13, rue de Chantepoulet
CH-1201 Genève

REVIEWS

Clement d'Alexandrie, *Les Stromates. Stromate VI.* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par P. Descourtieux (Sources Chrétiennes 446), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf. 1999, 422 pp., ISBN 2-204-06348-7, FF 183 (broché).

The Sources Chrétiennes edition of Stromateis 6 is a welcome addition to the study of Clement, already enhanced by texts and translations of Stromateis 1, 2, 5 and 7. In this book Clement deals with his central theme of knowledge and justifies his positive attitude to philosophy and Greek culture. Clement shows his continuity with second century Christian thought, continuing and developing the ideas of Justin and Irenaeus. Four concepts ruled this theology: God as universal Intellect, the economy of salvation, recapitulation of all things in Christ and participation in Christ and his salvation.

The achievement of Clement is not that he accommodated himself to the moods of his day but that he moved into philosophy, offering an account of the Christian wisdom by two moves, which are made clear in Stromateis 6. He joined divine Intellect to divine economy, and recapitulation in Christ to participation. After accounts of the divine Intellect who is universally present, he argues that the divine economy must also be universal. It is not enough to point to the Hebrew people; the Greeks were also within God's care. Just as the law prepared the Hebrews for Christ, so philosophy prepared the Greeks. Universal intellect, powerfully expounded by Clement, redefines the divine economy in universal terms.

Equally simple and innovative is the origin of the Christian sage or true Gnostic. Since all things are summed up in the perfection of Christ, the believer who participates in his universality, shows his perfection. Just as the Platonist lives in constant communion with the first principle of all things, so the Christian sage never ceases to pray to God.

In a word, the joining of Athens and Jerusalem, which the second century achieved and from which European culture took its beginning, is made explicit in Stromateis 6. It appears not as a facile adjustment to the culture of the day but as the mutual interaction of two pairs of concepts. Universal Intellect/economy produces philosophy as a preparation for Christ. Perfection/participation produces the Christian sage.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Descortieux has produced a fine edition, a well-argued text and a readable translation. In thirty-five places he argues for the retention of the reading of Laurentianus. I am not sure about μεταβολή at 49.6 or διά at 115.4; but there is soundness and good judgement throughout the work. The author lucidly presents the sequence of Clement's thought and rescues Book 6 from earlier rambling accounts. The volume is to be warmly commended.

La Trobe University and University of Melbourne ERIC OSBORN

Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists. Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1999, xiii + 312 pp., ISBN 0-19-826972-2, £ 48.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Most publications dealing with the history of the early Christian Eucharist take it more or less for granted that from a very early period onwards a relatively uniform rite came into existence. This rite, then, was an almost slavish imitation of the meals Jesus had held with his disciples, and especially of the Last Supper. One of the most characteristic elements of this supposedly very ancient and widespread rite would have been the consumption of bread and wine. Moreover, it is quite commonly assumed that very soon, after the separation of the 'real' Eucharist and the so-called agape-meal, the eating of other sorts of food during the Eucharist were prohibited.

This traditional picture of the early Christian Eucharist, however, is a one-sided and even a problematic one. One of the numerous problems it raises is that there is a great deal of historical data which points to all kinds of deviating practices, such as the use of other foods during apparently more or less sacred meals and in particular the existence of bread-and-water Eucharists. How should these practices be accounted for? Should they be viewed as marginal or heterodox deviations from a supposedly uniform and normative 'bread-and-wine pattern'? Or was this pattern not as universal as most liturgical scholars have thought and are still thinking? Moreover, what was the rationale behind the selection of some sorts of food and drink and the avoidance of other sorts in early Christian Eucharists? These are some of the most intriguing questions raised by such deviating early Christian communal meals, Eucharists or otherwise, and it is precisely these questions which inspired McGowan to devote a monograph to them.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

The first chapter, the reading of which may be warmly recommended to everyone involved in the study of early Christian liturgy, deals with questions of methodology. The author argues strongly in favour of a scholarly approach which focuses not so much on the origins and genesis of rituals—as the majority of historians of liturgy have done in the past and many of them still do—but rather on their social significance and on the symbolic force of eating and food. As was to be expected, M.'s sources of inspiration are social scientists such as Emile Durkheim, Claude Lévi-Strauss and especially Mary Douglas (he explicitly refers to her stimulating and seminal article 'Deciphering a meal'). Apart from emphasising the social function of meals and food, M. criticises the 'search for uniformity' which has been so predominant in the study of the early Christian Eucharist: this has led to a strategy of marginalisation of sources and phenomena which did not fit into the commonly accepted picture, such as the Didache and, precisely, the 'bread-and-water-Eucharists'.

Starting from the conviction that meals and food are systems of signs which should be understood by relating them to the world of culinary signification, itself being part of the wider world of social signification, M. presents in his second chapter a clear and well-balanced picture of the foods and their uses in Greek and Roman societies which, so M. emphasises (and in my view with good reason), were reflected both in Jewish and early Christian eating practices. M. distinguishes three categories: namely the 'humble person's diet' (mainly bread and vegetables, water and eventually some wine, but usually no meat or fish); the banquet or the 'symposium' which included the drinking of wine and was very common among religious associations; and the 'sacrifice of cuisine', that is to say the preparation and consumption of food that had been sacrificed or was used in a sacrificial ritual (principally meat and wine). This overview of different types of meals is followed by a paragraph on 'asceticism' which mainly deals with the avoidance of certain types of food, connected with sacrifice or otherwise, by certain groups such as the followers of Pythagoras, Cynic philosophers and different kinds of Jews.

In a sense, the core of the book is constituted by Chapters 3 to 7. In these chapters, the early Christian evidence for ritual meals consisting of other food than the expected bread and wine is examined and discussed. M. critically reviews all the sources referring to the use of cheese, milk and honey, oil, salt, fruits and vegetables and, of course, fish. One of the most remarkable conclusions he draws from this source material is that most of these customs are linked to the asceticism of certain groups and

that this asceticism most of the time derived from a radical rejection of everything connected with sacrifice and its cuisine—which included especially meat and wine—and indirectly of pagan society. Further, M. deals extensively with the eucharistic meals in which only bread and water were used. As might be expected, M. demonstrates—and very convincingly—that these cannot be accounted for as a rare and extreme adaptation of the 'original' bread-and-wine Eucharist by 'Encratite' groups, but represent an important and widespread tradition in Eastern Christianity, especially in Syria and Asia. A further remarkable conclusion is that—at least in an earlier period—the bread-and-water Christians did not make a sharp and absolute distinction between the communal celebration of the Eucharist and common day-to-day meals. What mattered to them in the first place was the distinction between their own meals and those of the rest of (pagan) society. On the other hand, the bread-and-wine pattern (which gradually became characteristic of more 'orthodox' groups) reflected a more accommodating attitude towards society; whereas it was precisely these groups that tended to attach more and more importance to a clear distinction between the Eucharist and other food and meals and, moreover, gradually adopted a sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist (the first witness to this tendency was Cyprian).

Generally speaking, M.'s description and analysis of the relevant evidence are both illuminating and innovating. Some remarks, however, are in order. First of all, some of M.'s original and stimulating conclusions and hypotheses inevitably remain somewhat speculative. In my view, this holds in particular for the link he assumes to exist between the selection of specific sorts of food (bread, salt and so on) and the avoidance of wine on the one hand and the rejection of the cuisine of sacrifice on the other hand. The question may be asked to what extent other factors may have played a role as well. The refusal to drink wine, for example, may also have had a more general ascetic background and have been occasioned by an abhorrence of drunkenness and the loss of self-control it implies. In addition, critical remarks may be made with regard to some details. It is, for instance, rather surprising that the differences between the Greek and the Syriac versions of the Acts of Thomas are not mentioned (191-194) since they are certainly relevant to the issue (the Syriac version often represents a more 'accommodating' and 'orthodox' position). Further, the suggestion that the blessings of olives, cheese, all kinds of vegetables and fruits and even the 'oil of the sick' which are encountered in the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* are interpreted as originally belonging to a eucharistic meal set-

ting (127) is not very convincing; and in my view it becomes all the less so since a very early origin of this document (first part of the third century) is more and more called into question. The most fundamental objection which may be made against M.'s approach, however, is his consciously exclusive focus on the food which goes so far as to completely cordon off the ritual setting of such meals: including the prayers, blessings, invocations of the Spirit, the Logos, the divine Name and so on. In a sense, a deliberate focus on the food may be legitimate and even be considered a salutary antidote against the one-sidedness of traditional scholarship which often too exclusively has fixed its attention on the ritual texts and their contents. This approach, however, has its limitations and these become particularly clear when one, as M. does, tries to arrive at a classification of different Eucharistic meals. In that case, one cannot get away from taking into account the ritual setting and in particular the texts (in so far we have any information about them). For the rest, it is not unlikely that such a broadening of scope might even corroborate and substantiate a great deal of the conclusions drawn by M.!

In Ch. 7, the author deals with what is without doubt one of the most difficult questions raised by the 'bread-and-water Eucharists', namely their relation to the New Testament evidence regarding the celebration of the Eucharist and early Christian meals. As might be expected, M.'s conclusions remain somewhat tentative and unsatisfactory for one who is expecting clear solutions. Thus, he posits with good reason, that the use of water in the Eucharist was an early tradition which cannot have emerged later than the end of the first century and might even go back still further (219). On the other hand, M. is obliged to acknowledge that most of the possible links with the water-and-bread tradition he believes to discover in some New Testament passages are oblique and indirect or open to question. This conclusion may appear unsatisfactory, but probably nothing more can be said with certainty. More questionable is the second part of this chapter where M. considers the New Testament texts which are usually considered to be authoritative for eucharistic meal practice, in particular which one would expect to have been embarrassing to 'bread-and-water Christians' since they presupposed the drinking of wine. In itself it is understandable that this question is raised by M. and that he tries to answer it; and most of the observations M. makes about the position those Christians took with regard to his tradition definitely make sense. The problem, however, is that prior to raising this question M. should have dealt with another problem, namely the question of whether early Christian Eucharists as

such, including the drinking of wine or otherwise, were fashioned after the model of the Last Supper. It may be pointed in this connection to the Eucharistic celebration in the Didache which, by the way, is rightly called by the author a litmus test for the presuppositions of modern scholars about early Christian meals. This celebration begins with the blessing of a cup of wine but, as M. again rightly argues, it does not contain a reference whatsoever to the Last Supper or to Jesus' death. What does this mean? I think we should at least reckon with the possibility that early Christian Eucharists as such, whether they entailed the drinking of wine or not, were not modelled after the pattern of the Last Supper or that they were only on some occasions (for example at Passover, as I have suggested myself elsewhere: *Questions liturgiques* 74 (1993), 89-112). In that case, the phenomenon of the 'bread-and-water Christians' would appear in a different light: they would become still less marginal or deviating from the mainstream, whatever that may have been, than M. seems to assume. For the rest, this might also place in a different light another question dealt with by M., namely that of the dual origin of the Eucharist as hypothesised by H. Lietzmann. Though following the last-mentioned scholar in his critique of the traditional presupposition of the original uniformity of the early Christian Eucharist, he nonetheless criticises Lietzmann's theory for not sufficiently taking into account the diversity of practice regarding food and drink in early Christianity. Instead of two Eucharists it would be better to speak of many kinds of Eucharist (250, see also 27). The objection I would like to make is that, contrary to Lietzmann, M. wrongly leaves out of account the influence of the Last Supper tradition. There is no question that this tradition must have begun to play a prominent role from a certain period onwards. In the past, scholars have thought this process did start very early. Lietzmann, however, realised that this did not hold for all regions and this led him to develop his theory of dual origins. At the moment, many scholars tend to argue that in all regions early Christian Eucharists were structured and fashioned after the model of the Last Supper only gradually. This means that the idea of a dual *origins* is now open to question, or has become problematic. This, however, does not alter the fact that it remains very probable that during a certain period two types of Eucharistic meals existed side by side: one explicitly influenced by the tradition of the Last Supper and modelled on its pattern and the other following an older tradition. It remains the merit of Lietzmann to have drawn attention to this possibility.

All in all, McGowan's monograph begs some fundamental questions.

Nonetheless it is an illuminating and valuable book which fills a gap in the history of early Christian Eucharists and distinguishes itself from other works on the subject by its original and innovating methodological approach.

NL-3584 CS *Utrecht*, G. ROUWHORST
Katholieke Theologische Universiteit
Heidelberglaan 2

April D. DeConick, *Voices of the Mystics. Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 157. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, 191 pp., ISBN 1-184127-190-X, UK £ 31.50/US $ 52.50.

After rather obscure speculations about the author's 'Point of Discourse' and the 'Interpretative Trajectory toward the Synthetic End Point', DeConick offers a complete survey of Vision Mysticism in the Ancient World. Its roots certainly lay in the piety and worship praxis of the Greek and Hellenistic mystery religions. From there it spread to Hermetism (also a mystery religion), which is at least as old as the first century of the Christian Era. The recently recovered Demotic text *The Book of Thoth* even predates the Greek Hermetic writings.

Although the notion that the vision of a god makes one divine is Greek in its origin, early Jewish apocalypticists and mystics, precursors of later Merkabah mysticism, seem to have welded this idea into their traditions about celestial journeys. Ezekiel the Dramatist, who lived in the second century BC, describes how Moses is divinized after having seen the Glory (kabôd) of God, called Man. If certain postmodernist thinkers, mourning after God's death, deny that there is an authentic religious experience behind these and similar texts, they should at least admit that the ancients believed they experienced the Sacred. I agree and add that John, the author of the Apocalypse in the New Testament, may have had a similar experience: 'and the child (Jesus) was caught up unto God and to his throne' (12:5). There Jesus seems to have identified himself with the kabôd, having become 'one like unto the Son of Man', no other than the Man of Ezekiel the Dramatist.

DeConick continues to show that Philo Judaeus also frequently describes Moses' attempts to behold God after he has ascended to heaven. The first certain reference, however, to Merkabah mysticism occurs in the Qumran literature: this may represent a community of Jewish mystics who liturgi-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

cally built a heavenly Temple in their midst and entered it to worship alongside the angels before God's throne chariot (cf.: *cum omnibus archangelis et angelis* of the *Missa Romana*). This, then, is a completely new and probably correct background both for the Vision Mysticism and the reaction against it of the author of the Fourth Gospel. In her Ann Arbor dissertation *Seek to See Him* (E.J. Brill, 1996), DeConick has argued that the ontological elevation and space travel of the soul, which she calls 'Ascent and Vision Mysticism', is the real issue of the Gospel of Thomas. Logion 50 does describe how the soul, before or after death, is interrogated by the Archonts, custom house officers in the air, and knows all the required answers:

> *If they ask you: 'Where are you from?',*
> *say to them: 'We have come from the Light . . .'.*
> *If they ask you: 'Who are you?',*
> *say: 'We are the sons and the elect of the Living Father'.*
> *If they ask you: 'What is the sign, that your Father is within you?',*
> *say to them: 'It is a movement and a rest'.*

The aim and purpose of the author of the Fourth Gospel is to refute this concept. He edited the Johannine tradition which originated in Palestine and was subjected to Syrian influences, before it reached Ephesus, where it was fixed. The original sense of 'I am the door' may have been that Jesus was the open door in heaven which admitted the faithful to the spiritual world above. (In fact, there existed a version of this logion: 'I am the gate (*pylè*)'). For John, Jesus in the flesh was the only door. Nobody has ever seen God, but his incarnate Son reveals him. The Logos of the Prologue of his Gospel is not Wisdom, but the Name of God, he embodies the kabôd exclusively; and during his historical absence, the Paraclete, which is present in the community, represents him. Here John uses Judaic Christian traditions transmitted by Elkasai and the *Ascension of Isaiah* of two Paracletes, the Messiah and the Holy Ghost, standing before God's throne and interceding for the sinful believers. But according to John, the Ghost is down here, on earth.

From this convincing argumentation the present reviewer concludes that then the Gospel of John is trinitarian and that the classical dogma of the Early Church (One Being (*ousia*), three modes of being (*hypostaseis*)) is a correct translation of Judaic Christian tradition.

DeConick then tries to prove that the discourse between Vision Mysticism and John's polemic against it is continued in later writings. She quotes passages from the *Acts of John* ('written in Syria'), the *Gospel of the Saviour*

(Papyrus Berolinensis 22220, ed. by Hedrick and Mirecki), the *Epistula Jacobi apocrypha* of the Jung Codex, the *Ascension of Isaiah* ('from Syria') and the *Dialogue of the Saviour* (which indeed originated in Edessa). This part of the study is not wholly convincing, because it is not certain that the *Acts of John* and the *Ascension of Isaiah* do come from Syria. Moreover it is more than doubtful that the author of the *Gospel of John* knew the *Gospel of Thomas*, as the authoress thinks. It is safer to assume that the last mentioned writing was composed towards 140 AD in Edessa, though grounding in a Judaic Christian Palestinian source (50 AD), and a Hellenistic, Encratic source (Alexandria 100 AD). However, John may have known the Thomas tradition.

This book is original, courageous and well documented. The authoress knows her languages, especially Coptic, Hebrew and Greek. It is a good book. I want to make two further comments:

A. The imaginative space travels of Antiquity are not exclusively Greek and Jewish, they also have an Egyptian component. On a shroud of the second century found at Saqqara, the deceased is represented standing *before the door* of the Hall of Absolute Truth. In his hands he holds a scroll containing the magical formulae, with which he assures his innocence and proclaims to know the names of the gods he has to pass before he can enter the realm of eternal bliss (Doxiades, *Mysterious Fayum Portraits*, New York 1995, 21). There cannot be any doubt that this concept was transposed from the Underworld into the air, when heaven became the ultimate destiny of the blessed souls. Just as Virgil in his *Aeneis*, book VI, has transposed the Nekyia (a visit to the Underworld) into an ascent to the Elysium, so the gnostics have located and positioned the Egyptian Underworld in the heavenly spheres (I owe this insight to my Utrecht colleague H. Nelson).

B. The Egyptian gnostic Valentinus has adapted this myth to express his views about the encounter of a deceased spiritual man with the guardian angel to whom he was assigned at baptism and who is waiting for him at the entrance of the spiritual world, the Pleroma. In an unnoticed passage about the Valentinians in Carthage and about Valentinus himself, Tertullian declares:

> *When first the souls have left the bodies after death and in every floor of the seven heavens have been inspected by the archonts to establish if they can be admitted, and when they have been asked the secret pass-words which are in use among these heretics, then they have to make their confession in a face-to-face encounter with the real authorities, their true man (veros homines), namely the Theleti (their beloved bridegrooms), the Acineti (the immovable*

ones), and the Abascanti (the tutelary spirits beyond Fate, who protect against the witchcraft of the Evil Eye), as Valentinus calls them. (Theletos scilicet et Acinetos et Abascantos Valentini.)

Scorpiace X, i, Reifferscheid/Wissowa CCL 2,1087.

After death, man will be confronted with his real Self, the only one to whom he is accountable. This happens in the Eighth Sphere in the interim until the end of the world process. Christ there expects those who are his and cannot enter Nirwana, until all are saved. With him wait the Guardian Angels:

Thus takes place the rest of the spiritual men in the 'Lord's day' (the Eighth Sphere which is called the Lord's day) with the Mother (Sophia) . . .
Then takes place the Supper of all those who are being saved, until all (angels and their counterparts) have become equal to each other and have recognized each other.
Then the pneumatics lay down their souls. With the Mother who leads her bridegroom, they also lead their bridegrooms, their guardian angels and enter the bridal chamber inside the Limit, which is the border of the Pleroma.

Excerpta ex Theodoto 63-64, Sagnard 184-186.

Of course they enter through the door. More specifically, according to the Valentinians, Christ himself is the door to eternal bliss:

When Jesus says 'I am the door', he means to say: 'You will come no further than the Limit (of the Pleroma), you spiritual men'. When in the end of the world process he himself will enter the Pleroma, also the spiritual race will enter with him, brought together and brought in through the Door.

Excerpta ex Theodoto 26,2-3, Sagnard 112.

Nothing prevents us from assuming that the concept of an immortal race at the entrance of the spiritual world is due to Valentinus himself. Tertullian is a trustworthy source for the reconstruction of the original doctrine of the Master himself. In fact the words: 'Theletos et Acinetos et Abascantos Valentini' are an unnoticed fragment of Valentinus. This implies that the whole notion of an ascent of the soul along the custom house officers on the seven planets and her encounter with her Self and counterpart goes back to the founder of the sect.

Nor can there be any doubt that Valentinus was a gnostic, who distinguished between the Unknown Godhead and a personal god. The same Tertullian says so in a passage in his work *Against Praxeas* (3, 6): 'plures (dei) secundum Valentinos et Prodicos', which should be translated as: 'more than One God, according to men like Valentinus and Prodicus' (cf. Tacitus: Gracchi atque Saturnini). Prodicus was a leader of the sect of the Gnôstikoi and lived in Alexandria (Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* III, 4, 30). The Gnôstikoi produced the *Apocryphon of John*, which is very critical

of the demiurge. Valentinus was of the same opinion. The question mark behind Valentinus gnosticus can be deleted.

Perhaps one might say that Ascent Mysticism is pre-gnostic anyhow. It is quite possible that the author of the Fourth Gospel is polemicizing against this myth. Strictly speaking, his Gospel is anti-gnostic. This insight we owe to April D. DeConick.

Noordhoudringelaan 32, GILLES QUISPEL
NL-3722 BR *Bilthoven*

W.J. Aerts – G.A.A. Kortekaas (Hgg.), Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius. Die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Übersetzungen, I. Einleitung, Texte, Indices Locorum et Nominum, II. Anmerkungen, Wörterverzeichnisse, Indices, CSCO 569-570, Subsidia 97-98, Louvain 1998, 218 p. (I), 231 p. (II), ISSN 0070-0444; ISBN 90-429-0010-5, 90-429-0011-3.

Nachdem G.J. Reinink 1993 den syrischen Text von Ps. Methodios' Apokalypse (CPG 1830), einer mêmrâ mit einem an der geschichtlichen Vergangenheit orientierten (I-X) und einem prophetischen Teil (XI-XIV), publiziert hatte, war endgültig erwiesen, daß die lange der vier erstmals von V.M. Istrin 1897 edierten griechischen Rezensionen, nämlich die hier kritisch herausgegebene Rezension I, eine Übersetzung der syrischen Apokalypse ist, und somit bestätigt, was schon einige Forscher zuvor, insbes. P.J. Alexander, F.J. Martinez und H. Suermann mit gleichzeitigen Veröffentlichungen (1985), vorgetragen hatten. Diese Übersetzung steht jedoch dem ursprünglichen syrischen Text, von den Hgg. "der Ursyrer" genannt, nicht ferner als die beiden bekannten syrischen Rezensionen, sofern der Übersetzer insbes. im prophetischen Teil nicht einfachhin seine Vorlage wiedergibt, sondern auch Eigenes einbringt oder für Griechen Unverständliches verändert. So läßt er z.B. in seiner Darstellung des byzantinischen Kaisers der Endzeit die aus dem syrischen Julian-Roman stammende, auf Kaiser Jovian gemünzte Typologie hinter dem aus der syrischen Alexanderlegende stammenden Bild des Kaisers Herakleios und seines Sieges über die Perser verblassen. Diese griechische Übersetzung ist einzig in relativ jungen Handschriften überliefert, deren älteste (G) auf das Jahr 1332/33 datiert ist. Die von den Hgg. genannten 15 Handschriften sind schon seit der Edition von A. Lolos (1976) bekannt. Die eliminatio codicum beruft sich auf "Überprüfungen", die Lolos "mit seiner Wahl der (vier) Haupt-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

handschriften (rechtgeben)" (S. 39). Die constitutio textus gründet sich vor allem auf zwei dieser vier Codices, nämlich B aus dem 15. und D aus dem 16. Jh. Einzig dort, wo der syrische Text und die lateinische Übersetzung (s. unten) mit B und D nicht zu vereinbaren sind, wird die Lesart der oben genannten Handschrift G "und/oder R" (S. 40) aus dem 15. Jh. eingebracht. Als wichtiges Kriterium für die Textkonstitution erweist sich die 710/720 bzw. "reichlich vor der Schlacht bei Poitiers (732)" (S. 16) angefertigte lateinische Übersetzung, die wohl jener Mönch Petrus geschaffen hat, von dem das Vorwort stammt und dessen Heimat die Hgg. im Kloster Corbie oder Luxeuil vermuten (S. 30). Denn es handelt sich um eine sklavisch genaue Übertragung: "Verbum-e-verbo" (S. 25).

Die hier vorgelegte Edition derselben basiert sich wie die editio princeps von E. Sackur (1898) auf die vier ältesten der ca. 50 bisher bekannten Handschriften der Rezension I (S. 31). Angemerkt sei, daß diese in Westeuropa weniger verbreitet war als die zweite und dritte Rezension (S. 19, Anm. 46; 33-35). Für alle vier Rezensionen sind bisher ca. 220 Handschriften erfaßt (S. 19); das älteste Testimonium stammt von jenem 784 verstorbenen Salzburger Bischof, der die unter dem Namen Aethicus Ister laufende Kosmographie verfaßt hat. Nachdem Reinink die syrische Apokalypse im Blick auf die Geschehnisse unter ʿAbd-al Malik auf 682-692, und zwar "eher später als früher", datiert hatte (S. 4), nehmen die Hgg. an, daß "der Ursyrer um 690" entstanden ist (S. 16), so daß einerseits "die edessenische Adaptation", deren Schluß F. Nau 1917 ediert hat, "schon vor 692" angefertigt worden sein kann (S. 7), anderseits im Blick auf die Datierung der lateinischen Übersetzung nur eine kurze Zeitspanne für die Verbreitung des syrischen Texts in verschiedenen Rezensionen und für die Anfertigung der griechischen Übersetzung übrigbleibt, nämlich "die Zeitspanne zwischen 700 und 710". Letztere dürfte in einem Kloster entstanden sein, in dem Mönche verschiedener Herkunft, insbes. Syrer und Griechen, miteinander lebten. In Betracht kommen darum u.a. nicht nur Damaskos und Jerusalem, sondern auch der Sinai. Nun fällt aber auf, daß die griechische Übersetzung den Text ihrer syrischen Vorlage in X,4 durch eine Aussage ersetzt, die fast wörtlich auch in der dem Anastasios Sinaites zugeschriebenen Disputatio adversus Iudaeos (CPG 7772) erscheint (PG 89, 1212 BC). Die letzten Worte dieses Texts greifen außerdem jenes Thema der je tausendjährigen Herrschaft aufeinanderfolgender Reiche auf, das in der syrischen Apokalypse (X,5) folgt und dort mit dem Kampf des römischen Reichs gegen jenes "der Babaren, d.h. der Türken und Avaren," d.h. mit der Belagerung von Konstantinopel im Jahre 626 endet, in der Disputatio

jedoch mit der Vernichtung des Persischen Reichs "durch diese Barbaren, die Türken," abschließt, d.h. mit dem, was in X,6 als Sieg der Araber dargestellt wird. Wie Reinink datieren die Hgg. in ihrem Kommentar die Disputatio auf das 9. Jh. Da eine kritische Edition der Disputatio nicht vorliegt, die das Verhältnis zu dem Dialog der Juden Papiskos und Philon mit einem Mönch Anastasios (CPG 7796) und zu der von Romanus Paschalis im 12. Jh. in Konstantinopel angefertigten lateinischen Übersetzung einer "disputatio Iudeorum contra sanctum Anastasium" (ed. G. Dahan, 1976) zu klären hat, wird man der Datierung in der von A. Mai benutzten Handschrift (1237 B 6-11; ferner 1225 D 4-5) mit Vorbehalt begegnen. Denn ihr entspricht in CPG 7796 die Nennung des Jahres 670 n.Chr. Eine dieser Datierung entsprechende Parallele liest man auch in der noch nicht edierten Karfreitagspredigt des Anastasios (CPG 7754). Wichtig ist in diesem Zusammenhang, daß die Disputatio (CPG 7772: 1224 B 1-2; C 12-1225 A 7) zu dem paßt, was wir über die Münzprägungen der Byzantiner und der Omaijaden am Ende des 7. Jh.s wissen. Die Einführung eines rein arabischen Münzwesens unter 'Abd-al Malik wird m.W. auf ca. 693 datiert. Vielleicht läßt sich nach Erscheinen der in Vorbereitung befindlichen Edition der Disputatio des Anastasios Eindeutigeres zum Entstehen der griechischen Übersetzung sagen. Der Kommentar der Hgg. greift vieles von dem auf, was man in den reichen Anmerkungen von Reinink's Übersetzung der syrischen Apokalypse findet, bringt aber auch mit seiner Fülle an Details insbes. zu philologischen Fragen viel Neues und ist somit insbes. wegen seiner Indices ein wichtiges Arbeitsinstrument. Auch wenn die Hgg. gewiß die deutsche Sprache gut beherrschen, so hätte es nicht geschadet, den Text jemandem vorzulegen, für den Deutsch Muttersprache ist.

Faculteit der Letteren, KARL-HEINZ UTHEMANN
Vrije Universiteit,
De Boelelaan 1105,
NL-1081 HV Amsterdam

M. De Groote (Hg.), Oecumenii commentarius in Apocalypsin (Traditio exegetica graeca, 8), Leuven 1999, uitgeverij Peeters, 355 p., ISBN 90-429-0236-1.

Die sorgfältige kritische Edition von Oikumenios' Kommentar zur Apokalypse des NT (CPG 7470) ersetzt die editio princeps von H.C. Hoskier (1928). Seit 1991 hat M. De Groote Beiträge publiziert, die der Vorbereitung

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

dieser Edition dienten. Die direkte Überlieferung des in zwölf Abschnitte aufgeteilten Text ist eindeutig. Der Hg. gibt für die constitutio textus zurecht dem aus dem byzantinischen Italien stammenden Text gegenüber der auf dem Athos und in Konstantinopel beheimateten Überlieferung den Vorzug. Der Text aus Süditalien ist einzig im ältesten uns erhalten gebliebenen Zeugen, einer Handschrift aus der ersten Hälfte des 12. Jh.s (M), vollständig bewahrt. Sieht man von Codices ab, die als Kopien eliminiert werden können, dann liegt diese Textform ohne das lange Mittelstück II,7 – VIII,341 noch in drei Zeugen aus dem 16. Jh. (V, S, T) vor, deren Vorlage aus dem Jahre 1213 stammt. Die Athostradition wird durch zwei Handschriften des 14. bzw. 15. Jh.s bezeugt (B, P), jene aus Konstantinopel durch einen Kodex, den der dortige Patriarch Kallinikos III. im Jahre 1736 geschrieben hat (Z). Die auf S. 37-46 vom Hg. vertretene Hypothese, Z verrate eine Kenntnis einerseits von B und P, anderseits eines Ablegers der süditalienischen Überlieferung, hat den Rez. nicht überzeugt. Angesichts der in I,1-48 vorgetragenen Argumente für die Identität des Sehers von Patmos mit dem Evangelisten Johannes, dürfte die Annahme des Hg.s unwahrscheinlich sein, daß der im süditalienischen Text überlieferte Anhang XII,407-452 auf Oik. selbst zurückgeht. Für den Hg. ist diese Stelle wegen der Datierung des Kommentars wichtig, sofern in XII,444-446 unter Hinweis auf die Kirchengeschichte des Eusebios von Kaisareia das Exil des Johannes auf Patmos (Apc. 1,9) auf die Zeit von Kaiser Domitian (81-96) gelegt wird, eine Datierung, die man, nun aber unter Hinweis auf die Chronik des Eusebios, auch in I,257-259 liest.

Der Hg. hat, gestützt auf Untersuchungen von A. Monaci Castagno (1980, 1981), in Sacris Erudiri 36 (1996) 67-105, eine der oben erwähnten Vorarbeiten (vgl. vom Rez.: ZAC 3 [1999] 6), die eigentlich kurz zusammengefaßt in der Einleitung zu dieser Edition hätte wiedergegeben werden müssen, dafür plädiert, daß Oik. ein im späten 6. Jh. lebender Exeget, "möglicherweise" als Neuchalkedoniker ein Angehöriger der Reichskirche, gewesen sei. Oik. paßt seinen Kommentar in eine heilsgeschichtliche Sicht ein, die mit der Himmelfahrt Christi "die Zeit der Inkarnation" (XI,63.87) des Gott Logos abschließt und jene der Herrschaft Christi und des Geistes, auch jene "der ersten Auferstehung (Apc. 20,5), nämlich der Auferstehung im Glauben" genannt, eröffnet, die bis zur zweiten oder "allgemeinen Auferstehung der Körper" bei der Wiederkunft des Herrn dauert (XI,87-101) und zur Unterordnung aller Mächte unter Christus (I Cor. 15,24-28) führt (X,120-142; vgl. zu Matth. 6,10: XII,359-362). Dabei schließt er jede Form eines sich auf Apc. 20,1-8 berufenden Chi-

liasmus aus, da es sich nach ihm an dieser Stelle um eine Allegorese für die Unberechenbarkeit der (zweiten) Parusie handelt (X,416-487; XI,51-62; s. unten). Diese Heilsgeschichte ist Werk der Trinität (XI,74-76), "der einen Usie und Gottheit" (X,112-113). Auch wenn die Geheime Offenbarung Christus "mehr mit seiner menschlichen Seite" zeige (I,55-56), so schließe dies nicht aus, daß er in ihr auch als der inkarnierte Logos erscheint. Man dürfe bei Christus "das Göttliche nicht ohne das Menschliche und das Menschliche nicht ohne das Göttliche" (I,81-82) auffassen und darum weder Eutyches noch Nestorios folgen. Der Emmanuel ist als eine Einheit (ἑνότης) "aus zwei Naturen" zu bekennen, deren jede "vollkommen . . . ihre naturhafte Eigenheit und Differenz besitzt", da die Naturen "nach der Einung" (μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν) weder vermischt und verändert noch getrennt sind (I,71-77; II,337-346). Für diese Formel beruft sich Oik. in XII,334-350 ausdrücklich auf Kyrill von Alexandrien und dessen Erläuterung der Union von 433 im Laetentur-Brief (CPG 5339). Dabei greift er mit der Formel ἡ κατὰ ποιότητα φυσικὴν ἰδιότης zugleich des Severos von Antiochien († 538) Sicht, insbes. dessen Reaktion auf Eutyches und Julian von Halikarnaß, auf, die bei Kyrill vorbereitet war (z.B. CPG 5340: ACO I,1,4, 26,26; 27,13-14; CPG 5346: ACO I,1,6, 159,21). Doch bleibt er mit dem Bekenntnis zur "einen Person und einen Hypostase" auf dem Boden der Union von 433 (CPG 5339) und insofern von Chalkedon (451), auch wenn kein Hinweis oder Name fällt, der dies eindeutig kundgibt. Sofern er die Formel "der einen Energie" Christi benutzt, könnte man sein Anliegen mit jenem vergleichen, das sich für fast alle Neuchalkedoniker bis zur Krise der reichskirchlichen Orthodoxie im 7. Jh. nachweisen läßt (StPatr 29 [1997] 373-413; Augustinianum 39 [1999] 5-83): Er sucht nach einem Verständnis des Wirkens Christi, das dieses "der einen Hypostase" bzw. der ἕνωσις καθ'ὑπόστασιν (II,405-406; X,344-349; XII,136-137) zuordnet (XII,346-347). Insofern scheint dieser Oik. in die Geschichte des Neuchalkedonismus, nicht aber in jene des Monophysitismus zu passen, auch wenn er nirgends neben der Kyrillischen Formel "aus zwei Naturen", in deren Kontext ein Verhältnis der Naturen "vor und nach der Einung" unterschieden wird (s. oben), die chalkedonische Formel "in zwei Naturen" gebraucht. Nirgends jedoch begegnet im Kommentar die Formel "der einen Natur des inkarnierten Logos".

Wie aber steht es dann mit jener vom Hg. 1996 nicht berücksichtigten Tatsache, daß in einigen unter dem Namen eines Oik. in Pauluskatenen überlieferten Zitaten die Formel der μία φύσις auftaucht und dort, wo als Variante μία ὑπόστασις erscheint, wohl die ursprüngliche Lesart darstellt? Sollte Oik. dennoch Monophysit sein? Dies hat F. Diekamp schon 1901 behauptet; doch datierte er Oik. auf die Zeit um 600. Sollte man diese

Datierung, die sich auf I,91-95 (s. unten) beruft, in Frage stellen dürfen? Sollte Oik. mit einem Korrespondenten von Severos aus den Jahren 508-518, einem Hofbeamten mit dem Titel Comes, identisch sein und dieser der im Breviarium des Liberatus (ACO II,5, 133,21) genannte Scholastikos aus Isaurien sein? Sollte somit eine monophysitische Katene aus dem 7. Jh. Recht haben, wenn sie aus dem Kommentar XI,244-255 zitiert (was leider im Apparat der Testimonien nicht vermeldet wird) und den Autor desselben mit dem genannten Korrespondenten des Severos identifiziert? Dies ist die These von A. Spitaler und J. Schmid (1934, 1938), die J.C. Lamoreaux in VC 52 (1998) 88-108 gegen die genannten Vorarbeiten des Hg.s wieder aufgegriffen hat, der mit seiner Spätdatierung des Kommentars zur Apc. zwei Autoren namens Oik. annehmen muß. Die uns erhaltenen Reste des Briefwechsels von Severos mit dem Comes Oik. lassen erkennen, daß letzterer besonders an dem Problem des Wirkens Christi und damit an der Frage der Vereinbarkeit des Tomus Leonis mit Kyrills Aussagen über die Einung der Naturen und das eine Wirken des Inkarnierten sowie an der Bedeutung der Union von 433 interessiert war, zwei Fragen, die u.a. auch für die Beurteilung des Henotikon wichtig sind. Die für das Henotikon entscheidende Aussage über die göttlichen und menschlichen Werke und Taten des Inkarnierten, d.h. über die biblischen Hoheits- und Niedrigkeitsaussagen, wird im sog. ersten Brief dess Severos an Oik. in jenem Stück (PO 12,2, 181f.) angesprochen, das auch in den Akten des 6. Ökumenischen Konzils überliefert ist (ACO ser. 2, II,1, 374,21 – 376,11). Gerade diese Aussage findet man vielfältig auch in neuchalkedonischen Quellen. In dieser Hinsicht sind die Handbücher zu korrigieren.

Bei einer Datierung des Oik. in das frühe 6. Jh. ließen sich alle genannten Tatsachen miteinander vereinbaren, insbes. weil sich damals die Diskussion um Kyrill und die Union von 433 im Blick auf die Aussagen von Chalkedon noch in einer gewissen Bewegung befand. Man könnte hier auf einen analogen Fall verweisen. Zacharias Rhetor aus Gaza, der zu Anfang des 6. Jh.s als Anhänger des Severos von Antiochien auftrat, dürfte mit dem nach 527 amtierenden, in den Akten der 536 gehaltenen Synode von Konstantinopel genannten reichskirchlichen Bischof von Mytilene identisch sein. Wie ist die in I,91-95 genannte Datierung zu verstehen? Im Blick auf die Ankündigung von Apc. 1,1, daß die Prophezeiungen des Sehers von Patmos sich "in Kürze" erfüllen sollen, sagt dort Oik., daß bei einem wörtlichen Verständnis der Formel "in Kürze" das Problem entsteht, daß diese Ankündigungen sich noch nicht erfüllt haben, "obwohl . . . schon mehr als 500 Jahre" vergangen sind. Die Formel müsse darum anders verstanden werden. Sie meine keine bestimmte Zeit, da bei Gott 1000 Jahre wie

ein Tag (Ps. 89,4) sind (I,95-103), womit er schon einleitend auf die Apc. gegründeten chiliastischen Berechnungen (s. oben) den Boden entzieht. Diese Aussage besaß angesichts der Datierung der Inkarnation auf das Jahr 5500 der byzantinischen Ära eher zu Beginn als am Ende des 6. Jh.s. eine gewisse Aktualität. Der Autor hat bis zu dieser Stelle nichts darüber gesagt, daß er mit Eusebios die Prophezeiungen des Sehers auf die Zeit von Kaiser Domitian (81-96) datiert. Dies erwähnt er erst in I,257-259. Da ein Leser in I,91-95 diese Aussage noch nicht kennt, wird er die genannten 500 Jahre nur allgemein mit den Ankündigungen des Endes der Welt und der Parusie verbinden. Hätte der Autor selbst hier schon Eusebios' Datierung im Blick gehabt, dann hätte er diese hier einbringen müssen. Zur Interpretation der Zeitangabe vgl. man auch H.J. Lehmann, On Some Round Numbers in Some Patristic Texts, Aarhus 1974. Wäre Oik. ein strenger Monophysit, dann könnte der positiv wertende Hinweis auf Evagrios Pontikos (VI,68) auch ins späte 6. Jh. gehören. Doch angesichts dessen, daß die christologischen Aussagen des Kommentars nicht monophysitisch sind, sondern durchaus in die Vorgeschichte des Neuchalkedonismus passen, dürfte nicht nur das Lob des Evagrios, sondern auch die Exegese von Apc. 9,5-6, die nicht eindeutig eine Apokatastasis ablehnt, sondern einen Mittelweg vorschlägt (V,320-340), ein Hinweis sein, daß dieser Text in der ersten Hälfte des 6. Jh.s., nicht aber in der Zeit nach der Verurteilung des Origenes und Evagrios unter Kaiser Justinian verfaßt wurde. Leider wird dieser Zusammenhang mit dem Neuchalkedonismus der Zeit Kaiser Justinians durch die im apparatus fontium genannten Quellen nicht belegt. Auch wird der in der süditalienischen Überlieferung von V, S and T für Oik. im Lemma bezeugte Titel Rhetor, der dem bei Liberatus genannten Scholastikos entspricht (anders urteilt der Hg. 1996, S. 93), in den Apparat verbannt. Die Edition wird mit einer Wiedergabe der Scholia (S. 295-308) und mit vier Indices abgerundet, deren wichtigster jener zu den Parallelen in den Kommentaren des Andreas von Kaisareia (CPG 7478) und des Arethas ist, die beide den Kommentar des Oik. benutzt haben. Ein Desiderat bleibt vor allem ein Verzeichnis wichtiger Begriffe. Mit der vorliegenden, sorgfältig erstellten Edition ist ein Unternehmen erfolgreich abgeschlossen, das Maurits Geerard, der Verf. der Clavis Patrum Graecorum, angeregt und mit Interesse begleitet hat.

Faculteit der Letteren,
Vrije Universiteit,
De Boelelaan 1105,
NL-1081 HV Amsterdam

KARL-HEINZ UTHEMANN

Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum LXXXVI). Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, x + 332 pp., ISBN 90-04-10388-0, DFL 180/US $ 106 (clothbound with book jacket).

There are several ways in which one can approach the figure of Philo of Alexandria and his writings. Some scholars interpret him as a Greek mystic wearing Jewish robes; others place him within the context of Gnosticism or Middle Platonism. In the second half of the last century the understanding has emerged that Philo is first and foremost an exegete. Peder Borgen is an important representative of this view, which appears from the title of his monograph on Philo: *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for His Time.* In the preface to this study he writes that he has gained the insight that there is a relationship between exegesis, exegetical traditions, contemporary ideas, and historical context. The present monograph is based on this insight.

In accordance with his view Borgen begins this study by dealing with the historical context in which Philo lived. He also compares Philo with other Jewish writers. One of his conclusions is that Philo is not an isolated figure outside the broad stream of Jewish convictions and attitudes that were present in the Jewish community in Alexandria. In the Jewish community the Septuagint played a central role and most of Philo's writings consist in exegesis of and expositions on the Laws of Moses. Borgen divides them into two main groups: A) Rewriting of the Pentateuch, consisting of the Exposition of the Laws of Moses, *On the Life of Moses*, and *Hypothetica*; B) Exegetical commentaries, to which the Allegorical Commentary on Genesis, and the *Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* belong. Following P.S. Alexander, Borgen argues that Philo's exposition of the Laws of Moses belongs to the genre of the 'rewritten Bible'. According to Alexander 'Rewritten Bible texts are narratives, which follow a sequential, chronological order. Their framework is an account of events, and so they may described broadly as histories' (p. 56). Philo's rewritten Bible is comparable to, for instance, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities.*

Much attention is paid to the structure of the Philonic treatises. Borgen argues that the exegetical form of question and answer is central, because it occurs in the *Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, in the Exposition, in the *Life of Moses*, and in the Allegorical Commentary. The same form is also found in rabbinic exegesis. In a separate chapter Borgen offers a detailed examination of *On the Giants* and *On the Unchangeableness of God.* He

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

shows that the form of question and answer is very prominent, but Philo also uses other expository forms, like e.g. a direct paraphrasing exegesis.

Having analysed the formal structure of Philo's exegetical writings, Borgen looks for a directive hermeneutical principle in Philo's exegetical labours. According to Philo the translation of Moses' Laws has as goal that these Laws should be accepted by the whole world. Philo's exposition of the Laws continues the presentation of these Laws to the Greek-speaking world. It is a *proclamatio graeca*. The Jewish exegete can interpret a biblical text on two or three levels: 1) the level of the concrete and specific events; 2) the level of the cosmic and general principles; 3) the level of God's realm above the created world.

Borgen illustrates the first level, which concerns the practice of the Laws, on the basis of the treatises *On the Embassy to Gaius* and *Against Flaccus*. They are generally characterised as historical writings, but Borgen argues that they have to be understood within the context of the practice of the Law. They show how the Laws of Moses are at work in the Jewish community and can cause trouble and conflicts. In these works Philo applies Pentateuchal principles to historical events and persons, and Borgen shows that Philo does the same in his exegetical writings.

There were not only violent relations between the Jewish community and its environment—as one can see in *On the Embassy to Gaius* and *Against Flaccus*—, but there was also a more positive form of interaction. At various places in his writings Philo focuses on persons who become Jewish. Abraham, the founder of the Jewish nation was a proselyte and a model for other proselytes. The coming in of proselytes and movements of reaching out to non-Jews indicate the universal role that the Laws of Moses have to play. The Laws are universal because they are a manifestation of the cosmic principles. Philo combines universalism with a particularistic understanding of Moses' Laws, because he considers those who keep the Laws of Moses as the true human beings.

In this monograph Borgen discusses many interesting aspects of Philo's thought and his writings. Considering Philo first and foremost as an exegete, he offers a sound and valuable approach to Philo. His observations on the formal structure of Philo's writings—especially his detailed examination of some treatises—are very helpful for obtaining insight in the structure of the commentaries, which seems at first glance to be rather chaotic. I do, however, have my doubts about the qualification of the Exposition of the Law as rewritten Bible. The Exposition is more than only the rewriting of the Bible: it also contains Philo's own allegorical interpretation and exe-

gesis. In *De Abrahamo*, for instance, Philo alternates the literal narrative with an allegorical exegesis. He also changes the biblical order of the events in Abraham's life. Therefore, I think that the definition of rewritten Bible does not adequately cover the method that Philo uses in the Exposition. Despite this remark I can recommend this monograph to everyone who is interested in Philo's exegesis, which, as we all know, had a strong impact on the theologians of the early Church. With this monograph Borgen has again shown that he belongs to the most prominent Philonic scholars of our time.

NL-4206 VD *Gorinchem*, IJsbaan 175 A.C. GELJON

BOOKS RECEIVED

Augustinus: *Sancti Augustini Opera, Enarrationes in Psalmos 101-150, Pars 3: Enarrationes in Psalmos 119-133*, edidit Franco Gori (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum XCV/3), Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2001, 340 S., ISBN 3-7001-2981-5, ÖS 993 (broschiert).—'Hoc volumine, quod primum est eorum quibus Augustinianarum Enarrationum nova editio constabit, illae quindecim emendatae et apparatu critico instructae eduntur, quas Augustinus dixit super Psalmos graduum (119-133); re vera autem sermones quattuordecim sunt, cum eorum novissimus Psalmos 132 et 133 una enarret'.

Barnes, Michel René, *The Power of God. Dynamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*, XVI + 333 pp., Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 2001, ISBN 0-8132-0929-3, $ 64.95 (cloth).

Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, Correspondence, volume II: *Aux cénobites*, Tome II, *Lettres 399-616*. Texte critique, notes et index par François Neyt & Paula de Angelis-Noah, traduction par Lucien Regnault (Sources Chrétiennes 451), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, p. 462-912, ISBN 2-204-06490-4, FF 229 (broché).

Bouter, P.F., *Athanasius van Alexandrië en zijn uitleg van de Psalmen. Een onderzoek naar de hermeneutiek en theologie van een psalmverklaring uit de vroege kerk*, Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum 2001, 379 pp., ISBN 90-239-1151-2, NLG 65 / Bfr. 1300 (pb).—Doctoral thesis Utrecht University (promotor R. van den Broek) on Athanasius of Alexandria's *Expositiones in Psalmos*. With an extensive summary in English.

Conybeare, Catherine, *Paulinus Noster. Self and Symbols in the Letters of Paulinus of Nola* (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000, xii + 187 pp., ISBN 0-19-924072-8, £ 35,00 (clothbound with book jacket).

Dictionary of Manichaean Texts, Vol. I, *Texts from the Roman Empire (Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin) compiled by Sarah Clackson, Erica Hunter, Samuel N.C. Lieu in association with Mark Vermes* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia II), Turnhout: Brepols 1999, XVI + 246 pp., ISBN 2-503-50819-7, EUR 88 (cloth).

Drobner, Hubertus R., *Augustinus von Hippo, Predigten zum Buch Genesis (Sermones 1-5). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen* (Patrologia. Beiträge zum Studium der Kirchenväter, Band VII), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern etc.: Peter Lang 2000, 228 S., ISBN 3-631-36976-X, SFR 56,- (pb).—Wichtige Einleitungen, Übersetzungen und Erläuterungen eines bekannten Spezialisten; kleiner (aber bedeutungsvoller) Schritt zu einer künftigen deutschen zweisprachigen Gesamtausgabe der Predigten Augustins. Die Einleitungen und Anmerkungen erläutern kurz das zur Einordnung und zum Verständnis der Texte Erförderliche: Echtheit, Überlieferung, Chronologie, Textkritik, Struktur, Stil, historische Daten, Theologie, Liturgie. Mit ausführlichem Register.

Eusèbe de Césarée, *La théologie politique de l'Empire chrétien. Louanges de Constantin (Triakontaétérikos)*. Introduction, traduction originale et notes par Pierre Maraval (Collection «Sagesses Chrétiennes»), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, 216 pp., ISBN 2-204-06617-6, FF 165 (pb).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Gnilka, Christian, *Prudentiana I: Critica*, München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag 2000, 762 S. + XX Tafeln, ISBN 3-598-77436-2, DM 238 / SFR 212 / OES 1737 (Gebunden).

Harrison, Carol, *Augustine. Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Christian Theology in Context), Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000, xvi + 242 pp., ISBN 0-19-875220-2, £ 35,00 (clothbound with book jacket).

Hill, Charles E., *Regnum caelorum. Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids, Michigan / Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans 2001, xx + 324 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4634-3, $ 30.00 / £ 19.99 (pb).—Second revised edition of an acclaimed book.

Hombert, Pierre-Marie, *Nouvelles recherches de chronologie augustinienne* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 163), Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes 2000 [Diffuseur exclusif: Brepols, Turnhout, Belgium], XIV + 667 p., ISBN 2-85121-180-3, FF 448 / EUR 68,30 (pb).

Kreider, Alan (ed.), *The Origins of Christendom in the West*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 2001, xvi + 371 pp., ISBN 0-567-08776-X, £ 24,99 (clothbound with book jacket).—Thirteen essays on the theme, e.g. by Ramsay Macmullen ('Christianity Shaped through its Mission'), Wolfgang Wischmeyer ('The Sociology of Pre-Constantine Christianity'), Christine Trevett ('Charism and Office in a Changing Church'), Anne Jensen ('Women in the Christianization of the West'), Everett Ferguson ('Catechesis and Initiation'), David F. Wright ('Augustine and the Transformation of Baptism') and Rowan Williams ('Defining Heresy').

Leo Magnus: *St. Leo the Great, Sermons and Letters against the Manichaeans. Selected Fragments. Introduction, Texts & Translations, Excursus, Appendices, and Indices* by Hendrik Gerhard Schipper & Johannes van Oort (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Latina, Vol. I: *Sancti Leonis Magni Romani Pontificis, Sermones et Epistulae, Fragmenta Selecta*), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, VI + 154 pp., ISBN 2-503-511160-0, EUR 66 (cloth).

Leyerle, Blake, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage*, Berkely, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press 2001, XVI + 244 pp., ISBN 0-520-21558-3, $ 45 / £ 29.95 (clothbound with book jacket).

Ludlow, Morwenna, *Universal Salvation. Eschatology in the Thought of Gregory of Nyssa and Karl Rahner* (Oxford Theological Monographs), Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000, xiv + 304 pp., ISBN 0-19-827022-4, £ 48,00 (clothbound with book jacket).—A comparison and assessment of the arguments for universal salvation by Gregory of Nyssa and Karl Rahner.

Miller, Patricia Cox, *The Poetry of Thought in Late Antiquity. Essays in imagination and religion*, Aldershot / Burlington USA / Singapore / Sydney: Ashgate 2001, x + 287 pp., ISBN 0-7546-1488-3, £ 42.50 (hardback with book jacket).—Collection of thirteen previously published studies (e.g. in *Vigiliae Christianae*), supplemented by a list of Abbreviations, an Introduction, three brief Prefaces introducing the book's three Parts (I: 'Poetic Images and Nature'; II: 'Poetic Images and the Body'; III: 'Poetic Images and Theology') and a Bibliography. In the various studies, pride of place is given to Origen, asceticism and Gnosticism. Without indices.

Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine, Tome 4: *L'âge de transition: de la littérature romaine à la littérature chrétienne, de 117 à 284 après J.-C.* Édité par Klaus Sallmann e.a., édition française sous la direction de François Heim et collaborateurs, Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 758 pp., ISBN 2-503-51013-2, EUR 112 (hb).

O'Daly, Gerard, *Augustine's City of God. A Reader's Guide*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1999, xii + 323 pp., ISBN 0-19-826354-6, £ 48.00 (clothbound with book jacket).

Oort, Johannes van, Otto Wermelinger & Gregor Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies XLIX), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 2001, X + 337 pp., ISBN 90-04-11423-8, DFL 196,13 / EUR 89 / US $ 104 (clothbound).—K. Rudolph, 'Augustinus Manichaicus—das Problem von Konstanz und Wandel', 1-15; W. Beltz, 'Augustins "manichäischer Erbteil", dargestellt an *De mendacio* und *Contra mendacium (Ad Consentium contra mendacium)*', 16-23; I. Bochet, 'L'unité du *De utilitate credendi* d'Augustin', 24-42; J.K. Coyle, 'What Did Augustine Know About Manichaeism When He Wrote His Two Treatises *De moribus*?, 43-56; F. Decret, 'Objectif premier visé par Augustin dans ses controverses orales avec les responsables manichéens d'Hippone', 57-66; A. Hoffmann, 'Erst einsehen, dann glauben. Die nordafrikanischen Manichäer zwischen Erkenntnisanspruch, Glaubensforderung und Glaubenskritik', 67-112; M. Lamberigts, 'Was Augustine a Manichaean? The Assessment of Julian of Aeclanum', 113-136; S.N.C. Lieu, 'Lexicographica Manichaica: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, Vol. I, Texts from the Roman Empire (Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin)—an interim report and discussion of methodology', 137-147; A. Magris, 'Augustins Prädestinationslehre und die manichäischen Quellen', 148-160; J. van Oort, '*Secundini Manichaei Epistula*: Roman Manichaean 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine', 161-173; S.G. Richter, 'Bemerkungen zu verschiedenen "Jesus-Figuren" im Manichäismus', 174-184; J. Ries, 'Jésus Sauveur dans la controverse anti-manichéenne de saint Augustin', 185-194; H.G. Schipper, 'Melothesia: A Chapter of Manichaean Astrology in the West', 195-204; M. Scopello, 'L'*Epistula fundamenti* à la lumière des sources manichéennes du Fayoum', 205-229; G. Sfameni Gasparro, 'Au cœur du dualisme manichéen: La polémique augustinienne contre la notion de «mutabilité» de Dieu dans le *Contra Secundinum*', 230-242; E. Smagina, 'Das manichäische Kreuz des Lichts und der *Jesus patibilis*', 243-249; M. Stein, 'Bemerkungen zum Kodex von Tebessa', 250-271; J. Tubach & M. Zakeri, 'Mani's Name', 272-286; M.-A. Vannier, 'L'interprétation augustinienne de la création et l'émanatisme manichéen', 287-297; D. Weber, 'Augustinus, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Zu Augustins Darstellung und Widerlegung der manichäischen Kritik am biblischen Schöpfungsbericht', 298-306; G. Wurst, 'Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve', 307-324; W. Sundermann, 'Das Manichäerkapitel des *Škand gumânîg wizâr* in der Darstellung und Deutung Jean de Menasces', 325-337.

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres. [Tome] III: Homélies XX-XXVIII.* Texte latin de W.A. Baehrens (G.C.S.). Nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau (Sources Chrétiennes 461), Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, 396 p., ISBN 2-204-06708-3, FF 256 (broché).

Pouderon, Bernard & Yves-Marie Duval (éd.), *L'Historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles* (Théologie historique 114), Paris: Beauchesne 2001, XVI + 586 p., ISBN 2-7010-1413-1, FF 294 / EUR 44,82 (pb).—Publication impressionnante dans la fameuse série *Théologie historique* contenant 36 études qui résultent du *IIe Colloque international d'Études patristiques d'expression française* qui s'est tenu à Tours du 11 au 13 septembre 2000. Essais sur la presque totalité du thème par Enrico Norelli, François Paschoud, Gilles Dorival, Michel Quesnel, Simon Mimouni, François Blanchetière, Éric Junod, Hervé Inglebert, Charles Kannengiesser, Günter Christian Hansen, Marie-Anne Vannier, Patrick Laurence, Dominique Gonnet, Doron Mendels, Françoise Thelamon, Pier-Franco Beatrice, Georges

Tugene, Michel Fédou, Pierre Maraval, Guy Sabbah, Jean Bouffartigue, Jean-Noël Guinot, Annick Martin, Martin Wallraff, Luce Pietri, Yves-Marie Duval, Benoît Jeanjean, Stéphane Ratti, Dominique Bertrand, Bertrand Lançon, Marie-Ange Calvet-Sébasti, Emmanuel Soler, Alain Le Boulluec, Jean-Noël Pérès, Gianfrancesco Lusini, Maurice Vallery-Radot. Dimension en temps des études: de Luc, Papias et Hégésippe jusqu'à Bède le Vénérable. Le grand absent: Augustin d'Hippone. Manque un Index.

Richter, S.G., *Die Aufstiegspsalmen des Herakleides. Untersuchungen zum Seelenaufstieg und zur Seelenmesse bei den Manichäern* (Sprachen und Kulturen des Christlichen Orients, Band I), Wiesbaden: Reichert 1997, 212 S., ISBN 3-89500-056-6, DM 49 / EUR 25,05 (Geb.).

Richter, Siegfried G., *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library: Psalm Book, Part II, Fasc. 2: Die Herakleides-Psalmen* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Coptica, Vol. I, *Liber Psalmorum*, Pars II, Fasc. 2), Turnhout: Brepols 1998, VI + 124 pp. + 4 Tafeln, ISBN 2-503-50819-7, EUR 88 (cloth).

Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, *From Prophecy to Preaching* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae LIX), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2001, xi + 306 pp., ISBN 90-04-11689-3, DFL 152,06 / EUR 69,- / US $ 81.- (clothbound).

Syméon le Studite, *Discours ascétique*. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Hilarion Alfeyev, traduction par L. Neyrand (Sources Chrétiennes 460), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, 154 p., ISBN 2-204-06676-1, FF 100 (broché).—Syméon le Studite, ou le Pieux, est essentiellement connu comme le père spirituel de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, et la figure de ce maître occupe une place très importante dans la vie de son disciple. C'est du reste sous le nom du Nouveau Théologien qu'ont été longtemps transmis, dans la *Philocalie*, les trente-deux premiers chapitres du *Discours ascétique*. Ce petit livre dans la fameuse série *Sources Chrétiennes* présente la première édition complète du texte grec, aujourd'hui restitué à son véritable auteur. Édition du texte et longue introduction (11-69) par Hilarion Alfeyev, maintenant en charge, au partiarcat de Moscou, des relations œcuméniques; traduction par Louis Neyrand s.j., bien connu par ses nombreux ouvrages dans la collection *SC*.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Psalms. Psalms 73-150*. Translated by Robert C. Hill (The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation 102), Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 2001, xii + 383 pp., ISBN 0-8132-0102-0, US $ 39.95 (cloth with book jacket).

Vössing, Konrad, *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Collection Latomus 238), Bruxelles: Latomus. Revue d'études latines 1997, 690 p., ISBN 2-87031-178-8, EUR 87.85 (broché).

Wansink, P.L., *Irenaeus en het Oude Testament. Gnostische en heilshistorische exegese in de tweede eeuw*, Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum 2000, 269 pp., ISBN 90-239-0731-0, NLG 49.90 / Bfr. 998 (pb).—Doctoral thesis Utrecht University (promotor R. van den Broek) on 'Irenaeus and the Old Testament. Gnostic and history of salvation's exegesis in the second century'. With a summary in German.

White, Carolinne, *Early Christian Latin Poets* (The Early Church Fathers), London & New York: Routledge 2000, xii + 195 pp., ISBN 0-415-18783-4, £ 14.99 (pb).—New volume in the prospering series edited by Carol Harrison. After a general introduction ('Background to the texts', 3-23), Carolinne White sets accurate and sensitive translations of the fourth to sixth century poems in literary and historical context: Lactantius, Juvencus, Proba, Damasus, Ambrose, Augustine, Paulinus of Nola, Endelechius, Prudentius, Cyprian the Poet, Sedulius, Prosper of Aquitaine, Claudius Marius Victorinus, Paulinus

of Pella, *De ligno crucis*, Orientius, Dracontius, Avitus, Arator, Venantius Fortunatus. With glossary of metrical terms, notes, select bibliography, indices.

Wieser, Marie Therese, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus. Band VIII/1 Belgien, Luxemburg und Niederlande. Werkverzeichnis. Nach Vorarbeiten von Barbara Giorgi* (Österr. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Band 685; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der Lateinischen Kirchenväter, Heft XVII), Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 2000, 414 S., ISBN 3-7001-2959-9, ÖS 1226 (brosch.).

Wieser, Marie Therese, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus. Band VIII/2 Belgien, Luxemburg und Niederlande. Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken. Nach Vorarbeiten von Barbara Giorgi* (Österr. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Band 685; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der Lateinischen Kirchenväter, Heft XVIII), Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 2000, 338 S., ISBN 3-7001-2959-9, ÖS 1226 (brosch.).